

# THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLVI

SEPTEMBER, 1948

NO. 1029

## *Freedom of Information*

REV. L. J. BEAUFORT, O.F.M.

*Address delivered by a representative of the Netherlands to the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, Geneva, Switzerland, March 29, 1948*

WHEN facing a task that seems to be almost impossible of accomplishment, a Netherlander may be inclined to quote one of his greatest political leaders of the sixteenth century: "*N'est besoin d'espérer pour entreprendre, ni de réussir pour persévérer.*" These few words express the feelings brought along to this Conference by the Netherlands Delegation. We from the Netherlands feel that there is, under the present circumstances, not much hope of substantial agreement on matters involved in freedom of information, but we want to make every possible effort even if there were no hope of success at all; and if this Conference would fail in attaining concrete and

tangible results, the Netherlands would nevertheless persevere in trying to bring about a better understanding between the peoples of the world. After all that they have gone through in six years of the most terrible of all wars, this starting point does in my opinion not need any further explanation.

In his opening speech to this Conference, our President, General Romulo, has emphasized that the eyes of the world are focussed upon Geneva these weeks. In fact, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that many millions of men, especially those who during the war were deprived of every freedom of information by their national-socialist or fascist oppressors, have rea-

lized that, as it was expressed by the General Assembly in 1946: "freedom of information is the touchstone of all freedoms, to which the United Nations is consecrated." Where men are no more free to speak their minds, where the spiritual rights and freedoms of a people either in whole or in part are no longer safeguarded, where they are not free in their choice of the broadcasts they want to listen to, where they have no access to the sources of the news, there they do not live up to the elementary standards of human dignity, there they are easily poisoned and misled, and there one of the basic elements of human happiness—freedom—fails. So much millions and millions of people *know*, know not only theoretically but by bitter experience. No wonder that they look forward to what this Conference is going to achieve.

Mr. Chairman, the two peoples that brought so much misery and grief to the world are not represented at this Conference. Here we find the representatives of the peoples that undertook to defeat the German and Japanese rulers and that built up a United Nations. Nevertheless, it seems to be extremely difficult to find a common basis whereupon freedom of information can safely rest. No statement made in this Committee so far—and I feel that already many valuable contributions to our discussions have been made, in particular this morning by the honorable delegate of the

United Kingdom in his brilliant speech—no statement failed to emphasize that the speaker and the country for which he spoke are deeply attached to freedom of information, and the common reader of all these speeches might easily reach the conclusion, that nothing would be simpler than to arrive at unanimous agreement on the subject of our considerations. However, we *know*, and we should be realistic enough to acknowledge, that behind a similar terminology very different conceptions are hidden, and that only with the utmost effort a bridge, if any, can be built between them. It is only eagerness to contribute to a necessary clarification that inspires the Netherlands Delegation to make its own point of view for once and for all clear.

The distinguished delegate of the United States, in his excellent and eloquent statement made a few days ago, took a line of thinking on freedom, and freedom of information especially, very different from the point of view that so ably and with so much sharpness has been defended by our Polish colleague. In the United States, in the United Kingdom, and in a great majority of other European and non-European countries the system of legislation and the economic and social order aim at the personal rights of the individual. However great the differences between the conditions in these countries may be, all

of them are striving to preserve the rights of the individual and his chances to develop his spirit and his personal capacities. Since long, long years this system is called "democracy." In the sphere of freedom of information this is a system, Mr. Chairman, that allows a great many divergent opinions to be held and to be expressed. One can beyond doubt have objections to some particular developments of this system, but one never can deny that it is based upon the rights of the individual "to seek, to receive, to hold and to impart opinions and ideas of all kinds."

#### "PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY"

In countries like the USSR, Poland and others the system of legislation and the economic and social order are based upon "the broad masses of the people." However great the differences between the conditions in these countries may be, all of them have this in common, that they aim only at preserving some rights of these broad masses or of the community as a whole and have only little space left for individual freedom. This system, with a confusing terminology, is nowadays called "peoples-democracy," a term that does not make sense, because "democracy" means government by the people and peoples-democracy is therefore nothing but a pleonasm. Our Eastern-European colleagues assure us that freedom of information prevails in

their countries, too, but as far as I know only one opinion can safely be held and safely be expressed there: the opinion held and expressed by the government itself. In these countries there is no free choice between different newspapers, expressing completely different ideas. From the viewpoint of their governments such a system may be called "democracy" or "peoples-democracy" and they may pretend that they bring "freedom" to their peoples, but countries like the U.S.A., the United Kingdom and many other European and non-European countries believe that this system is the very denial both of freedom and of democracy.

Why, Mr. Chairman, should we neglect this basic difference? Why should we juggle with the term "democracy" instead of admitting frankly that there are two completely different approaches to freedom of information: one that goes out from the individual and the other that goes out from the "broad masses of the people," and which, by consequence, has only very little space for individual freedom, i.e. for democracy? Would it not serve much better the purpose of our meetings if we simply accepted the fact that these two different systems are represented at this conference; if we thereafter stopped exchanging useless criticism and tried to find out whether there is still some common ground in the matter of freedom of information?

But before undertaking an effort in that direction, there is one point I would like to single out, Mr. Chairman.

#### FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

On various occasions, e.g. by the delegate of the USSR, it has been argued that in this conference nothing should be agreed upon that would derogate from the absolute sovereignty of the individual state. It is for that very reason that our Soviet colleague is in favor of the deletion from our agenda of all those items that in his opinion interfere with that sovereignty; and the same tenor was to be observed in the statement made by the honorable delegate from Poland the other day. Mr. Chairman, the Netherlands Delegation would like to take a clear stand in this matter. We from the Netherlands do not understand how any international agreement, on any matter, is possible without the individual states being willing to derogate from their absolute sovereignty for the benefit of international rule. We firmly believe that absolute sovereignty is an obsolete conception and that to eliminate it for the benefit of worldwide co-operation belongs to the main problems of mankind on its road to history. The Netherlands is fully prepared to contribute to that co-operation and does not see how absolute sovereignty and international law possibly can be reconciled.

It was necessary for me, Mr. Chairman, to touch upon this point, as the contrast between absolute sovereignty and international law plays its part in the divergency of opinion prevailing in the field of freedom of information. The Russo-Polish view, if I may put it that way, is that in dealing with freedom of information every state may at any time fall back upon its own interpretation of its national and absolute sovereignty; the Anglo-American and Western-European view, on the contrary, hardly finds any limit to freedom of information derived from that sovereignty. Both for ideological reasons and for reasons originating from an irreconcilably different conception of international law, the bridge between the two viewpoints is by no means easily to be built.

In undertaking an effort to that effect, Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by saying that in the opinion of the Netherlands Delegation freedom and responsibility, like right and duty, are linked together and never can be untied from each other. We know that upon various occasions, under the pretext of responsibilities, freedom itself has been restricted or even annihilated. But however grave that danger may be, it never could induce me to stand for freedom without responsibility. Naive as it may sound, my great grandfathers, in drafting a constitution for the Netherlands in 1798, rightly said in the



Preamble to that Constitution, after having stated that all men have certain inalienable rights: "All the duties of mankind are based upon this sacred law: never do to other people what you would not like other people to do to you; and always do to other people so much good as you under similar circumstances would like them to do to you." Freedom is not only a right; it is, in itself, a responsibility as well. A world that looks upon freedom as a series of rights only is a world where the law of the jungle prevails, a world that is ruled by the principle "*homo homini lupus*," and I do not know of any country that practices such an absolute conception of freedom. Only a world that has accepted that every right is a duty, that every freedom is a responsibility—only such a world can live at peace, even though it lodges very difficult ideologies.

No government, Mr. Chairman, and no regime whatsoever, can make people feel responsible and make them act as such. Keeping alive a feeling of responsibility is in the first instance a matter for education of whatever kind. It is a professional matter as well. In the field of freedom of information, for example, it is up to the organizations of publishers, journalists, radio broadcasters and newsreel operators to establish professional standards of conduct, providing for the balance between freedom and responsibility. Does

this, then, mean that we in this Conference should only try to agree upon the freedom-side of the freedom, leaving the responsibility-side completely to educational and professional groups? Does it, in other words, mean that no general limitation should be set to the use that is to be made of the freedom of information? Does it, in still other words, mean that we should completely reject the Russo-Polish view, after which freedom of information should be used only to fight the remnants of fascism and the inciters of a new war?

Mr. Chairman, it is a shame for all of us that, hardly two years after the end of the war which caused such deep grief to mankind, we speak about a new war as if we spoke about a new suit. Nobody who really took part in World War II could speak lightheartedly about a new disaster that in practice would be inconceivably more horrifying than the one we have just lived through. No, Mr. Chairman, the Netherlands Delegation, coming from a war-stricken country and representing a people that was terribly tortured by the German war-criminals, is not less concerned, for example, than the Polish nation about a recurrence of nazi or fascist aggression, and not less opposed to war-mongering and provoking a new conflict. But, nevertheless, my Delegation firmly refuses to accept "fighting against the remnants of fascism and the inciters of

a new war" as the goals whereat freedom of information ought to aim.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I touch upon a matter of terminology. If there were any internationally accepted definition of what "Fascists" and "war-mongers" are, there would probably not be much difficulty. But actually conceptions of "Fascists" and "war-mongers" differ very widely. I know of good and faithful democrats who are called "Fascists" by all Communists; I know of peaceful and war-hating politicians who the Communists consider to be nothing but "war-mongers." And if, then, as a consequence of its absolute sovereignty, it be left to the individual state to decide which definition of "Fascist" and "war-mongering" is to be followed, it is not difficult to predict that, in accepting "fighting the remnants of fascism and the inciters of a new war" as the aims of freedom of information, this Conference would in practice achieve nothing at all. If, on the one hand, my delegation, acknowledging the link between freedom and responsibility, refuses to agree to a one-sided conception of freedom, it refuses on the other to accept the "Fascists" and "war-mongering" terminology that, in connection with the theory of the absolute sovereignty of the individual state, leads us nowhere but to the perpetuation of the present situation.

Whereas an absolute conception of

individual freedom opens the door for the destruction of freedom in the name of freedom, and whereas an absolute conception of the interests of the state or of the people opens the door to the destruction of freedom by fear that so-called "Fascists" or "war-mongers" might destroy it, the Netherlands delegation is in favor of a middle course. It would be happy if this Conference were ready to agree that freedom of information is an individual right, connected with an individual responsibility, and that this right finds its general limit in the Charter of the United Nations itself. That, in clearer words, nobody is entitled to use his freedom of information in such a manner as to endanger peace and security and undermine, or aim at the destruction of, the fundamental rights and freedoms to which the United Nations is dedicated.

#### COURT OF HONOR

Two principal consequences should be drawn from the eventual acceptance of this basic thought, Mr. Chairman. The one is that, in the national field, it be not left to the executive powers to decide whether a man, in using his freedom of information, has come into conflict with his duty not to undermine the respect for fundamental rights and freedoms, but that an independent judge, taking action upon a law defining clearly the elements of the case, should deal with

that matter. The other is that some international machinery be set up to take action on the same matter in the international field. As the question of setting up such international machinery is an item on the agenda of the Fourth Committee of this Conference, I will not go into any detail about it now. But allow me, Mr. Chairman, to point out that it is far from me even to think of "sanctions" to be imposed by an international organ against people who have "incited to war," or who, by false or distorted reports, have spread hatred and promoted dangerous misunderstanding between peoples. The first step in my opinion can only be the setting up of a kind of international Court of Honor, investigating

the cases brought up to it and promulgating its judgments, which, no doubt, would have a very great moral influence on the way in which freedom of information is used by individual correspondents and, on the other hand, handled by the various governments.

I hesitate to believe, Mr. Chairman, that I have presented any useful contribution to the building of a bridge between the two principally differing points of view. But I may conclude with those proud and courageous words, with which I began: "*N'est besoin d'espérer pour entreprendre.*" It is, especially when important problems are at stake, not necessary to hope. But it is necessary to try.



### *The Family and the Land*

"Ownership of productive property helps the individual and the family to develop. It gives a sense of responsibility, as well as a measure of economic security. When this productive property takes the form of land, then the family which lives upon it and by it avoids the congestion of our urban centers. It enjoys adequate light, space and air in which to work and play. Other things being equal its lot is better than its urban counterpart. Such ownership brings stability to social and religious life, supposing, of course, the proper economic levels are attained and social and religious facilities are available."  
—Rev. William J. Gibbons, S.J., Associate Editor of AMERICA, to the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Washington, D. C., Feb. 13, 1948.

# Contraception—A Violation of God's Law

WILLIAM J. KENEALY, S.J.

*A copy of the remarks of the Dean of the Boston College Law School before the Joint Committee on Public Health of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in re House Bill No. 1748. April 8, 1948.*

**M**R. CHAIRMAN and Gentlemen of the Committee on Public Health:

I appear before you, as a citizen of the Commonwealth, in opposition to House Bill No. 1748, the initiative petition to amend Sections 20 and 21 of Chapter 272 of the General Laws—which Chapter defines and penalizes "Crimes against Chastity, Morality, Decency and Good Order."

It is unfortunate, gentlemen, that the innuendo of several statements, made before this Committee and in the public press, makes it necessary for me to preface the substance of my opposition to this measure with the emphatic observation that this issue is not a religious controversy.

This issue is not a religious controversy within the meaning of Article XLVIII of the Amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth. This was clearly and unanimously decided by the Supreme Judicial Court in the case of a similar birth control petition in 1941: Opinion of the Justices, 309 Mass. 555.

This issue is not a religious controversy in the sense of a dispute between Catholics and non-Catholics.

Catholics did not enact the statutes now under attack; they were enacted at a time when Catholic legislative influence was either negligible or non-existent. Catholics did not originate the present initiative petition which seeks to amend these statutes; the proponents of the petition have insisted upon this fact. Catholics were most certainly not alone in the decisive defeat of the last birth control bill in 1942; a minority of less than forty per cent of the voters obviously could not have defeated the measure by 187,000 votes. Catholics are not alone in opposing the present birth control petition; to say nothing of others, the opposition of the Orthodox Jewish Rabbis is of itself sufficient evidence of this fact.

This issue is not a religious controversy in the sense that Catholics, either alone or in combination with others, are attempting to fasten specific Catholic theological dogma upon the citizenry of the Commonwealth! It is quite true that the Catholic Church teaches, and always will teach, the immorality of artificial birth control. But the Catholic Church also teaches, and with equal vehemence, the immorality of murder, rape, arson, larceny, slander and mal-

feasance in office. Is this teaching also an attempt to fasten Catholic dogma upon the citizenry of the Commonwealth? Do not think for a moment that my parallels are far-fetched. I have no hesitation in predicting that, before many years, this or some other legislative committee will conduct a public hearing on an initiative petition to amend our murder statutes for the purpose of legalizing so-called "mercy killings" within this Commonwealth. And I predict that, at that hearing, many Catholics will have the effrontery to present their ideas, as citizens, even though their ideas as citizens happen to coincide with their beliefs as Catholics. Surely, it takes no exhaustive intellectual effort to draw the simple and obvious distinction between a man's ideas as a citizen and his beliefs as a church member, even though his ideas and his beliefs coincide in a common conclusion. Gentlemen, if this distinction is not eminently reasonable and perfectly fair, then we are logically forced to the conclusion that the only citizen who should be allowed complete freedom of speech is the one who belongs to no church whatsoever.

I happen to be a Catholic priest, a lawyer and a citizen of this Commonwealth. Regarding this birth-control petition which has been submitted to the forum of free speech, I have a position as a Catholic priest; I have a position as a lawyer; and I have a position as a citizen. I do not

intend to speak as a Catholic priest; and this will be evident from the argument which I intend to make. I do not intend to speak as a lawyer; although I subscribe to the devastating legal analysis of the measure already made by Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Clark. But I do speak as a citizen of the Commonwealth; a citizen who confidently believes that his citizenship is not disenfranchised by his catholicism.

#### A MORAL ISSUE

The issue raised by this initiative petition is essentially a moral issue. It is a proposal to amend Sections 20 and 21 of Chapter 272 of the General Laws—which Chapter defines and penalizes "Crimes against Chastity, Morality, Decency and Good Order." Now the statutes under attack do not constrain or coerce anyone to take positive action against his or her conscience, no matter how erroneous that conscience may be. The statutes are not mandatory; they are prohibitive. They do not command anybody to do anything. They forbid the manufacture, exhibition, advertisement, sale, gift or loan of contraceptives. Why?

The answer to this all-important question is found, not only in the title of Chapter 272, "Crimes against Chastity, Morality, Decency and Good Order," but most conclusively in two decisions of the Supreme Judicial Court. Both decisions were writ-

ten by Chief Justice Rugg, one of the great chief justices of Massachusetts, a non-Catholic and, I am happy to say, an honorary alumnus of Boston College. In passing upon the statutes now under attack by the present petition, Chief Justice Rugg, speaking for an unanimous Court in 1917, said:

The statutes . . . contravene no provision of the Constitution. Manifestly they are designed to promote the public morals and in a broad sense the public health and safety. Their plain purpose is to protect purity, to preserve chastity, to encourage continence and self-restraint, to defend the sanctity of the home, and thus to engender in the State and nation a virile and virtuous race of men and women. The subject matter is well within one of the most obvious and necessary branches of the police power of the State. *Comm. v. Allison*, 227 Mass. 57.

Chief Justice Rugg, again speaking for an unanimous Court in 1938, said:

In framing legislation under the police power, the legislature, without any denial of rights under either the State or the Federal Constitution, might take the view that the use of contraceptives would not only promote sexual immorality but would expose the Commonwealth to other grave dangers. . . . The inference seems necessary that the moral and social wrongs arising from the prevention of conception appeared to the General Court so threatening in 1879, when the statute was originally enacted, that absolute and unconditional prohibition against the sale, gift or loan of contraceptive drugs, medicines, or articles for that end was necessary to meet conditions. A statute

of that nature is constitutional. *Comm. v. Gardner*, 300 Mass. 372.

Gentlemen, I do not believe it is necessary for me to elaborate any further on the proposition that the question, raised by this initiative petition, is not a religious controversy but is primarily and essentially a basic moral issue. This is clear from the very title of Chapter 272 of the General Laws; it is clear from the unanimous decisions of the Supreme Judicial Court; and it is clear from an analysis of the petition itself. It is a moral issue. Therefore, it can only be met, fairly and squarely, by a moral argument. That is why I am here.

#### THE MORAL ARGUMENT

The moral argument begins with God. The existence of Almighty God must be either proved or presupposed as a necessary and logical premise in any discussion about morality. Because without God, talk of morality is nonsense. Without God, there is no morality; there is only force—the force of unreasoning bullets or the force of equally unreasoning ballots. The existence of an almighty and a personal God is, of course, demonstrable by a process of unemotional and logical reasoning, from cosmic effects to the First Cause, from temporal motion to the First Mover, from contingent beings to the Necessary Being, from the stupendously

ordered universe to the Supreme Artificer.

But I should deem it discourteous to this Committee to consume your time in expounding the classic proofs of God's existence which stands impregnable against the skepticism of the ages. I shall presuppose His existence as you accept Him. I shall presuppose His existence as all parties to this dispute, Catholics, Protestants and Jews, accept Him. And I shall presuppose His existence as the fundamental law of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts accepts and describes Him.

The Preamble to our Constitution solemnly declares, in part:

We, therefore, the people of Massachusetts, acknowledging with grateful hearts, the goodness of the great Legislator of the universe, in affording us, in the course of His providence, an opportunity . . . of forming a new constitution . . . and devoutly imploring His direction in so interesting a design, do agree upon, ordain and establish the following Declaration of Rights, and Frame of Government, as the CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

And Article II of that Constitution states, in part:

It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society, publicly, and at stated seasons to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe.

Not only does the fundamental law of the Commonwealth gratefully ac-

knowledge the existence of a personal God, "*the Supreme Being*," "*the great Creator and Preserver of the universe*," but it expressly confesses "*His providence*," implores "*His direction*," and describes Him in its first constitutional breath as "*the great Legislator of the universe*."

Now this solemn constitutional declaration is not pious twaddle. It means something. But if it means anything, it means that the citizens of this Commonwealth, as citizens, acknowledge Almighty God as the great Legislator whose divine law impinges upon us, not merely in our private lives but also in our civic capacities. But how are we, as citizens, to know God's divine law? Surely, all parties to this controversy, men and women of all religious faiths, Catholics, Jews and Protestants—all know and believe that God has made known to us, through His inspired prophets, certain truths beyond the reach of unaided human reason, and certain obligations exceeding our naturally known duties. We call this divine revelation. But I wish to emphasize, again, that I do not base any premise of my argument upon divine revelation. I do not rely upon the specific theological dogmas of the Catholic Church or of any other church. The question is: how can we, not precisely as Catholics or Protestants or Jews—but how can we, as citizens, know God's law? Certainly not by wishful thinking, not



by letting emotion run away with intelligence, not by ignoring the impact of God's Will on human and civic life, but by a very serious and diligent investigation, as far as human reason will permit, into His divine Will. And His divine Will, as it has been known and can be known by human reason alone, we call the natural law.

#### THE NORM AND THE TEST

Now if He is a divine Legislator, He must have given us a law to guide our human and civic actions. But if He has given us such a law, it must contain some test, some criterion, some norm to measure the morality, the rightfulness and wrongfulness of our actions. What is that norm? What is that test?

The most general norm of morality, the most general test of right and wrong established by God's natural law is this: that a person's actions are morally good when they are in harmony with the human nature God gave him, and consequently with the Will of God Who created that nature; they are morally bad when they are in opposition to the human nature God gave him, and consequently in opposition to the Will of God Who created that nature.

Why is this true? Why is this the norm of morality? It is true because a Legislator could not be divine and legislate discord and confusion, frustration and contradiction, into the natures He created. Is it not true

that, throughout the entire universe, the legislative wisdom of God can be heard conducting, with infinite artistry, the overwhelming harmony of the cosmos? His legislation in the heavens and on earth, on land and sea and in the air, in His living and non-living creatures, in the laws of physics and chemistry and biology and logic, is the amazement of the artist, the scientist and the philosopher. And the constant and characteristic note of His legislation is a marvelous co-ordination of causes to effects, and a magnificent adaptation of specific means to their proper ends.

Nowhere is this legislative plan more manifest than in the constitution of living beings. In living beings, each faculty has its proper purpose, each organ has its proper function. Certainly, reason tells us, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the God of the living, who adapted vital powers to definite and obvious ends, must intend and will that vital powers should operate, as He made them, to the ends He appointed.

God Himself directs the activities of the lower animals by providing them with irresistible inclinations, which we call instincts, so that they employ their faculties, of necessity, in the proper manner for the proper purposes. There is no problem or question of morality among the animals, because they are not physically free to frustrate or thwart or defeat the nature that God has given them.

But man is free. We are the apex of God's visible creation. Made of body and soul, endowed with intellect and will, we are free, in many of our actions, to make use of the faculties and organs of our nature in the manner and for the purposes obviously intended by that nature and its Creator; and we are also free to use them in a manner and for purposes not so intended. We are physically free; but upon our choice depends the morality, the rightfulness or wrongfulness, of our actions. An intelligent God could not legislate otherwise.

Therefore, when a man freely and deliberately chooses to make use of a faculty or organ, and, in the very act of its use, takes positive measures to frustrate its purpose and defeat its end, he abuses that faculty or organ; he deliberately introduces discord and deordination into the nature God has given him; he thereby commits an immoral act forbidden by God's natural law. Allow me to illustrate by citing three actions universally condemned by all men as immoral and contrary to the natural law.

What is morally wrong with a lie?

The faculty of speech is obviously designed by nature to enable us to externalize our inner thoughts and to communicate them to others. When a man tells the truth, he uses the faculty of speech in the manner and for the purpose intended, consequently his act is morally good; when a man lies, he also makes use of the

faculty, but in its very use he deliberately frustrates its obvious purpose, consequently his act is morally bad.

What is morally wrong with gluttony and drunkenness? Why do we deprecate the actions of the ancient Roman gourmands who ate to satiety, went out to the vomitorium to regurgitate, and returned to the banquet hall to fill up again? The nutritive faculty is obviously intended to sustain bodily health. One who eats and drinks with moderation fulfills that natural purpose, and his eating and drinking is morally good; whereas the glutton and the drunkard do wrong, because in the very exercise of the nutritive faculty they defeat its purpose by their excesses.

What is morally wrong with masturbation? Again, a consideration of human nature clearly tells us that the reproductive faculties were designed by God so that man and wife might cooperate with their Creator in the production of new human beings for the preservation of the human race. This is the most sacred and primary purpose; an obvious secondary purpose is the furtherance of mutual affection between the cooperating man and wife. But the masturbator uses this sacred faculty of reproduction, and in the very act and manner of its use, he deliberately frustrates and defeats both primary and secondary purposes; wherefore he abuses his own faculty and nature; and

therefore his act is immoral and contrary to God's natural law.

The Creator, in His goodness and wisdom, has annexed to the exercise of all important human faculties varying degrees and kinds of pleasure; to the faculties of the soul as well as those of the body. He obviously does this to induce man to make use of the faculties He has given him. But when man makes the pleasure of the faculty his exclusive purpose, and deliberately exercises the faculty in an unnatural manner to the frustration of its natural purpose, he commits an immoral act. I have yet to read or hear another reasoned explanation of the immorality of human actions. This brings me to contraception.

At this point in my argument, I feel constrained to express regret at the necessity, not of *my* making, which forces me to discuss such matters before this Committee. The issue, however, is of paramount importance to the Commonwealth and its citizens; and I do not know how to meet it squarely without embarrassing language. I must ask you to bear with me.

George Bernard Shaw, some years ago, characterized artificial contraception as "mutual masturbation." I am not an enthusiastic admirer of Shaw, but I think his phrase is a demonstrably accurate characterization of the birth-control methods which this initiative measure seeks to legalize in Massachusetts. In solitary

masturbation, one person exercises the reproductive faculty and, in the very act, extracts sexual pleasure while thwarting the natural and intended purpose of the sexual powers. In artificial contraception, two persons cooperate in exercising the reproductive faculties and, in the very act, extract sexual pleasure while thwarting the natural and intended purpose of the sexual powers. What is missing in the parallel? What is the essential difference? Do not tell me that in the one case mere pleasure is sought, and in the other the object is to safeguard health! In both cases the immediate object is pleasure by means of an unnatural act; in both cases self-gratification is sought at the expense of the natural integrity of the marital act. The end does not justify the means. If a person can violate the natural integrity of the marital act with moral impunity, then I challenge anyone to show me the essential immorality of any sexual aberration. Allow me to explain this point.

#### A LINE MUST BE DRAWN

All men of every age have realized the sacredness of the reproductive function and its paramount importance to society; they have also realized that the vehemence of sexual pleasure leads to grave abuses to human and civil society. The common consent of mankind, civilized and uncivilized, agrees that it is of supreme importance that *some* line be drawn

between the lawful use and the unlawful abuse of the sex faculty, not merely as to extra-marital relations but also as to the use of the sexual powers within marriage. *Where* should that line be drawn?

If we study the nature of the reproductive faculties, the line obviously should be determined by *the natural integrity of the marital act*. But, if the natural integrity of the marital act does *not* determine the line, what does? What reason would we have for declaring *any* unnatural act between spouses immoral? If medical or economic or other considerations justify artificial contraception, why would not the same reasons justify sodomitic and other unnatural intercourse between husband and wife? I have never read or heard a logical argument to show an essential difference which would justify the one and outlaw the other. This initiative petition seeks to change Sections 20 and 21 of Chapter 272 of the General Laws. Would a *different* moral issue be raised if a similar petition should seek to change Sections 34 and 35 of the same Chapter, which stigmatize as felonies sodomy and other unnatural practices? I can see no essential difference unless we wish to adopt the philosophy of Mr. Justice Holmes who, writing a letter about unnatural sexual practices, said in substance that, after all, morality is merely a matter of taste! To that

philosophy, I am sure, neither the members of this Committee, nor the Legislature, nor the citizens of this Commonwealth are willing to subscribe.

So far, the positive side of my argument. I have been unable to read a transcript of the previous testimony before this Committee. I have, however, read considerable literature distributed by the Planned Parenthood League and I have followed the newspaper accounts of last week's testimony. I have been disappointed in that I have discovered only one witness<sup>1</sup> who appears to have attempted to meet squarely the traditional moral argument I have expounded. That witness, according to the daily press, testified as follows:

The Roman Catholic moral theologians differ from others by permitting only the so-called natural method of control of conception and deny the so-called unnatural or artificial methods are moral. . . . We reject that view. . . . To us, it would seem as reasonable and moral to hold that, if one's eyes are not normal, one may use exercises to improve his vision, but not spectacles, because the latter are unnatural. The unnatural methods of contraception are, to us, preferable both because they are more efficient and because they permit the normal relation to continue.

It is heartening to have at least one of the proponents of this initiative measure face the issue for what it is—an essentially moral question. I think, however, that an impartial analysis of

<sup>1</sup> Rt. Rev. Norman B. Nash, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Massachusetts.

the reverend and distinguished gentleman's argument will disclose either a profound misconception of the meaning of the traditional moral argument, or some rather startling fallacies in his answer to it. His argument is the dangerous one of analogy. The analogues are the reproductive faculty and the visual faculty, the sexual organs and the visual organs, the purpose of reproduction and the purpose of sight, the act of reproduction and the act of seeing.

#### STARTLING FALLACIES

The first fallacy in his analogical argument is discerned in the phrase "if one's eyes are not normal." The use of spectacles is essentially predicated upon defective visual organs; but the use of artificial contraceptives is *not* essentially predicated upon defective sexual organs. There is no analogy.

The second fallacy is seen in the phrase "to improve their vision." The use of spectacles is intended to, and does in fact, assist the eye in the very act of seeing; but the use of contraceptives not only does not assist the sexual faculty in the act of reproduction, it positively *impedes* the act from attaining its object. Again, there is no analogy.

(By way of a personal parenthesis, gentlemen, I must admit that a few months ago the advent of old age compelled me to adopt bi-focal spectacles. And I must confess that, while

getting accustomed to my new eyeglasses, a series of missed footsteps sorely tempted me to think along the lines of the reverend gentleman's argument and to believe that bi-focals, at least, were a species of *visual* contraception!)

The third fallacy lies in the statement "spectacles . . . are unnatural." Why are they unnatural? By what *serious* test? Are they any more "unnatural" than false teeth, wooden legs, ear trumpets, artificial hands or metal plates in the skull? These devices are used, not to thwart or frustrate the function of any faculty, but to assist defective organs to function properly and to protect the integrity of the body.

The fourth fallacy in the reverend gentleman's argument is contained in his statement that "The unnatural methods of contraception . . . permit the normal relation to continue." If he means to imply, as he seems to imply, that contraceptive intercourse is "normal" in the sense of morally justifiable, then he is guilty of the logical crime of *petitio principii*, of begging the question. The question is precisely the moral justification of contraceptives. If his meaning is that contraception permits marital intercourse to continue with "normal" frequency, he is still begging the question. The question is: is contraception *ever* morally justifiable.

The traditional moral argument proves that contraception, as a per-

version of nature itself, is intrinsically evil and is therefore never justified. This is true of any other intrinsically evil act, such as blasphemy, lying and drunkenness. It is wrong for a creature to revile his Creator at any time. Lying is lying, whether I propose to give it up after an isolated infraction of the truth, or whether I have an unalterable determination to lie as long as I have a breath. Theft is theft, despite the thief's intention to tread the path of honesty after acquiring a competency by his peculations.

It has been urged, in support of this initiative measure, that many people already practice birth control. Unfortunately, that is true. But many people blaspheme, lie, steal, slander, calumniate. Is that, of itself a sufficient reason for repealing the laws against blasphemy, larceny, fraud, slander and calumny? Is that any reason why the Commonwealth of Massachusetts should lend the dignity and majesty of its law to the approval of actions frustrating the sacred obligations of parenthood? I think most reasonable men will agree that a weightier reason is needed to justify tampering with our moral laws.

In 1941, a distinguished attorney of Massachusetts, Robert Dodge, arguing for a similar birth-control petition, testified that its rejection would be a good deal similar to the Legislature undertaking to say "that no one should be vaccinated against

smallpox." This is, again, an argument from analogy; but it would take a Solomon to discover the analogues. What act of what faculty is frustrated by vaccination? What purpose of nature is frustrated? Where is any plan of the Creator obstructed? If the argument merely means that the citizens of the Commonwealth should abdicate their judgment on moral matters in favor of some members of the medical profession, and that an alleged "approved medical practice" should become the civic norm of morality, then the learned attorney's argument is more lucidly stated by an eminent doctor, Dr. Nathaniel Faxon, one of the ten original signers of both the present petition and the 1941 petition, who said:

To me this is a medical problem, not a moral one, we are considering. The ethical relationship between patient and physician is that the patient places complete confidence and trust in his or her physician who, in accepting the patient, also accepts the responsibility to give of his best judgment and skill . . . according to what his peers consider to be good medical practice. . . . This is the ethical standard.

Now I submit that the statement of this distinguished physician, who echoes the sentiments of a number of his profession, sets up an unwarranted and dangerous standard of ethics and morality. Certainly, I have no desire or intention to attack the medical profession or any of its members. I have a most sincere and profound awe for

the scientific skill and devotion of the medical profession. If it were not for that skill and devotion, I for one would not be here today. Yet, with the utmost respect and sincerity, I am obliged to protest that the moral laws of the Commonwealth should not be determined by a mere counting of noses of any specialized profession, even when the moral issue affects that profession directly, and especially when that profession, as evidenced by this and the last hearing, makes little attempt to argue the merits of the moral issue involved.

What would happen if the citizens of the Commonwealth should abdicate their judgment in moral issues affecting the practice of the lawyer and the business man, the employer and the employee? Would it be wise and good public policy to refer all questions of legal and social justice, without discussion of the basic morality involved, to "approved legal practice" or to "approved business practice"?

The issue currently before us is whether we should advocate the withdrawal of a solemn legislative declaration of the moral law. Is it reasonable to do so without discussing the fundamental morality involved? For some doctors to request the citizens of the Commonwealth to discard the moral issue and trust merely to so-called "approved medical practice" is tantamount, it seems to me, to some business men requesting the citizens to ignore the moral issues of social

justice and trust merely to "approved business practice." Certainly, the doctor, as every other citizen, has the democratic right to advocate and propagandize his idea; but when his idea urges the legalization of a practice which the laws of the Commonwealth forbid as immoral, and which is demonstrated to be immoral by a traditional and rational argument, should he not in fairness be required to prove that the law is wrong, that the practice he advocates is not immoral, that his position is consistent with God's natural law?

It is true that the final action in the democratic process is determined by a counting of votes, whether in the Supreme Judicial Court, in the Legislature, or in the voting booth. But must not the intelligent vote be based on a reasoned consideration of the precise point at issue? If a show of hands is to be something more than a mere medium of force, must it not be preceded by a show of minds, by argument on the precise point at issue? But the precise point at issue is the morality or immorality of artificial contraception.

#### NATURAL LAW BINDING ON ALL

Almighty God respects the moral equality of all men. Hence He exempts no man from the obligations of his natural law. Elementary reason tells us that everyone, doctor and patient, lawyer and client, employer and employee, clergyman, legislator, judge



—all men, as men and as citizens, have the honor and the obligation to govern their lives and to shape and retain their civil laws in accordance with the Will of the "great Legislator of the universe," Who has manifested to them, by the light of human reason, the elementary precepts of His natural law.

But what about the occasional and rare case in which pregnancy *might* be dangerous to health or life? The natural law does not command any parents to have as many children as is biologically possible. It does not command pregnancy; it does not command the use of the reproductive faculty. It merely forbids the *abuse* and perversion of that faculty. If, in a rare instance, pregnancy is contraindicated, not by a prospective new Cadillac or by a neighbor's new mink coat, but by a grave danger to health, the obvious and safest and only moral remedy is either periodic or total abstinence.

But this is difficult! Yes, it is difficult. In a given case, it might well be heroic. In a given case, it might well be heroic to resist the temptation to murder, or to steal, or to violate any other of God's laws. The pathway of human life is strewn with temptations to immorality; but human nature, thank God, is equipped with the weapons of resistance, intelligence and free will. Intelligent self-restraint and self-control are necessary in every walk of life. Is it rea-

sonable to suppose that they are unnecessary in married life?

Must we suppose that the married persons, from whom the Commonwealth expects her future citizens, are helpless in the grip of an overpowering and irresistible sex urge which will brook no restraint or control within the marital bond? Such a defeatist attitude goes a long way toward the condonation or justification of marital infidelity. I for one refuse to subscribe to such an appraisal of the moral stamina of the mothers and fathers of this Commonwealth. It does not fit the facts of our history. It does not fit the facts of life.

In conclusion, Gentlemen, I would like to make an important observation. If it is true, as I have contended, that the natural law forbids the use of contraceptives as a gross abuse of a God-given faculty and as an unnatural repudiation of the sacred responsibilities of parenthood—if this is true, we should expect, *a priori*, that a wise and good God would so order His providence that suffering, disease and death would *not* ensue from a faithful adherence to His law. Has He done so?

I submit, Gentlemen, that Doctor Frederick Good and his medical confreres have already supplied this Committee with abundant *a posteriori* proof that He *has* done so. They have proved beyond question, by medical experience and by medical statistics,

that the health and life of men and women are better preserved by an enlightened medical practice, which treats creatures within the Creator's law, than by a medical practice which presumes to know more about those creatures than their Creator Himself. The claim that artificial contraceptives are ever necessary for the preservation of health or life is an emotionally superficial contention which simply does not fit the observable facts of life.

Gentlemen, this issue is a moral issue. It can only be decided with intellectual honesty, if it is decided

on the basis of moral argument. I have every confidence that the members of this Committee, the members of the General Court, and the citizens at large will so decide it at the polls. As one of those citizens, I urge all not to make a mockery of our Constitutional confession of "*the great Legislator of the universe*"; I urge all not to permit the majesty of our civil law to sanction a perversion of God's natural law; I urge all to defeat this initiative petition for the sake of "*Chastity, Morality, Decency and Good Order*" in this Commonwealth.



### *American Trade Unionism*

"In this great conflict between two philosophies the trade unions are an important ally of the West. In the first place, they are an effective champion of the idea of the dignity of the individual. They have introduced the equivalent of civil rights into industry and have given workers protection against arbitrary treatment by management. Thus they have made a major contribution toward implementing the philosophy of the West.

"In the second place, the rise of trade unions and the gradual development of a laboristic community opens up to employes great opportunities to participate in policy-making both in the plant and in the community. Russia is gradually creating a community in which individuals are vassals of the state—a new form of serfdom. Such an economy has little chance of holding its own in competition with a laboristic economy in which responsibility for decisions is widely dispersed and in which millions of employes have a chance to feel that they have a stake in the community."—*Sumner H. Slichter in N. Y. TIMES MAGAZINE, May 18, 1948.*

# Catholic Tests of a Social Order

REV. GEORGE G. HIGGINS

NCWC News Service\*

ARNOLD TOYNBEE, world-famous historian, tends to look at things against the broad perspective of centuries or millennia while the rest of us, as often as not, are narrowly preoccupied with this morning's headlines. He calmly pursues his research into the history of forgotten peoples and forgotten cultures while the rest of us are anxiously dialing the radio for the latest news flash. But Toynbee emerges from his library with some worthwhile conclusions about the present and some plausible predictions about the future while the rest of us, because we have neglected to study the past, too often fail to understand even the present about which we are so constantly concerned.

Consider, for example, the recent comments of Toynbee on the very timely issue of "free enterprise" versus "socialism"—a subject currently in the headlines, in one way or another, at least a dozen times a day. A "live" subject if ever there was one—but also, for Toynbee, if not always for the rest of us, a subject with a very ancient history. In his latest book, *Civilization on Trial*, he says: "In real life every social system that can be observed at first hand

or reconstructed from records is a mixed system, lying at some point between the two theoretical poles of undiluted socialism and undiluted free enterprise." Public relations department of the NAM, please copy!

"What the world needs above all now," Mr. Toynbee continues, "is to get the issue of free enterprise versus socialism off its ideological pedestal and to treat it, not as a matter of semi-religious faith and fanaticism, but as a common-sense, practical question of trial and error, of more or less, circumstance and adaptation."

This is not an original conclusion, of course, but coming as it does from the pen of a non-partisan and thoroughly disinterested historian, perhaps it will make an impression on the social thinking of Americans who are committed, says Toynbee, to an ideology which "lays great stress on the value of freedom, but seems less keenly alive to the need for social justice."

Toynbee's commonsense plea for a commonsense compromise as between free enterprise and socialism ought to be particularly well received by American Catholics. It harmonizes very well, indeed, with the traditional

\* 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 5, D. C., May 14, 1948

teaching of the Church as summarized, for example, in the encyclical of Pope Pius XI, *On Reconstructing the Social Order*. Catholic social teaching is unalterably opposed to socialism, strictly so-called, because socialism's "concept of society is utterly foreign to Christian truth." Mr. Toynbee, too, is opposed to socialism, strictly so-called, and presumably for the same basic reason.

But Toynbee isn't talking about socialism, strictly so-called, when he asks for a commonsense compromise between socialism and free enterprise. What he is asking for, in effect, is what Pope Pius XI asks for in his encyclical when he says: "First, so as to avoid the reefs of individualism and collectivism, the twofold character, that is individual and social, both of capital or ownership and of work or labor must be given due and rightful weight."

Toynbee suggests, politely and with excuses for our conservatism, that the United States is inclined—too much

inclined, if you will—to over-emphasize the individual character of ownership and work. And he further suggests that because we are "less keenly alive to the need for social justice" than we are to "the value of freedom," we are at a serious disadvantage, as a democracy, in competing with Communists for the allegiance of the dispossessed and suffering multitudes of Europe and Asia. "How far," he asks, "would the majority of the inhabitants of our hypothetical American sphere of influence be likely to be attracted by the present rather conservative American gospel of out-and-out individualism?"

How far, in other words, would the majority of the inhabitants of war-torn Europe be attracted by the policy of Wall Street—which is the symbolical, if not the actual, center of American capitalism—in trying, even at this late date, to prevent its workers from organizing effectively to protect their legitimate interests? How far indeed?



"The fact is, that, for good or for ill, nearly everything in our culture worth transmitting, everything which gives meaning to life, is saturated with religious influences, derived from paganism, Judaism, Christianity—both Catholic and Protestant—and other faiths accepted by a large part of the world's peoples. One can hardly respect a system of education that would leave the student wholly ignorant of the currents of religious thought that move the world society for a part in which he is being prepared."—*Justice Robert H. Jackson in the Champaign School Case.*

# Attitude of the Chinese Government to Catholic Education

REV. ALBERT R. O'HARA, S.J.

Professor, National University of China

Reprinted from CHINA MISSIONARY\*

FOR those who have lived long in China and for those who have read modern Chinese history, there is no doubt that there has been opposition at one period of that history to missionary education by the people of China and by the Chinese Government. Some would say that since the establishment of the National Government there has been no opposition. No doubt this would refer to the period after 1926, and even then many missionaries would disagree with this statement. Before 1926, and probably for some time after that date as a carry-over, there was definitely opposition and animosity toward all missionary education, which would include Catholic education. Let me quote a short passage from an Indian professor's article entitled, "An Oriental Looks at Christian Missions," printed in *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, (154: 598-606, 1927):

The anti-Christian movement of China similarly accuses Christianity of being a Westernizing force. The mission schools are accused of having

grossly neglected to emphasize Chinese culture and literature. This charge is substantiated by the fact that as a rule graduates of mission schools are woefully lacking in a knowledge of Chinese literature and in an ability to express themselves in correct Chinese. Let us suppose that the children of some of the schools of the state of New Jersey were taught Confucianism as the best code of morals; the geography not of New Jersey, and the United States but of Manchuria, Peking, Canton, etc.; the history not of the United States, but of the Chinese Dynasties and the Republic, etc. Would you say that these schools were training the young to take their places as intelligent citizens of the American republic?

Such was the attitude of the anti-Christian movement toward missionary education and such naturally was the attitude of the members of the government for the same logical reasons or because public opinion demanded it.

## RELIGIOUS OR POLITICAL OPPOSITION?

Did this opposition arise from a religious, or from a political and cultural viewpoint? Opposition on either ground would have been under-

\* Yoyang Road 197. Shanghai (18), China. Vol. 1, No. 2, March, 1948

standable and opposition probably came from both causes.

In the anti-Christian campaigns which started after 1920, the promoters of the movements, such as the youth associations, chose education as the main target of their attacks. The attack was led by returned students from France who had drunk deeply of the anti-clerical spirit of France of the first decade of the 20th century. Other self-styled intellectuals who had returned from Japan and America proclaimed the victory of positivism and pragmatism over all religious superstitions.

For many years the spearhead of this attack was Dr. Tsai Yuan-péi, a returned student from Paris. As President of Peking University and of the Academia Sinica, as several times Minister of Education, he wielded tremendous power and had a great following among educated Chinese. Even after his removal from the Ministry of Education, its policy was heavily influenced by him and his anti-religious prejudices. Dr. Tsai Yuan-péi stated: "Religion is merely a department of art, acceptable and useful only as far as it has helped men to feel the beauty of the universe, and worthless as soon as it has become influenced by dogmatic prejudices." (Damb. p. 16). Dr. Tsai always showed an intolerant attitude toward Christianity and tried his best to wipe it out of China. He joyfully boasted in public that Europe had already

given up religion; he urged that students should not be sent to America or Germany, where Christianity was still a great influence, but that they should be sent to France, where they had long since disposed of such medieval superstitions.

In his speeches and writings he emphasized the following three points: 1) There should be no faculty of theology in any university but only one of philosophy and one of comparative religion; 2) There should be no religious propaganda allowed in any school, neither should any worship or prayers be allowed; 3) Anyone who makes religious propaganda in any school should be banished from educational work.

An admirer and sharer of many of the same views of Tsai Yuan-péi was a returned student from America, Dr. Hu Shih. He stated quite openly:

We do not believe in you (missionaries) holding your text books and chalk in one hand and the Gospel of St. Matthew in the other. Education is for the good of the children and not for the glory of God. Schools are places for the development of human ability and not for the training of disciples of any particular sect. To utilize schools, to take advantage of the simple minds of children for religious propaganda is dishonest and immoral.

Ling Ken, a contemporary, stated:

I am convinced that the doctrine of an Incarnate God Who calls Himself Light of the World, asks from His followers an act of faith, promised forgiveness to repenting souls, and preached

God's love toward men, was horrible despotism. (Wieger VIII, 280).

Ch'en Tu-hsiu, the famous Marxist writer, advised his readers to leave aside the doctrines of Creation, Trinity and miracles, which were merely traditions from the past which had been nullified by the historical and physical sciences. Ch'en Li-fu, founder of the CC clique, begged the missionaries to pack up and return home in order to "preach their exotic religion to their own countrymen; we, Chinese, want none of it." Sanford Ch'en, one of the Chinese Protestant educational leaders, explained the aims of the Young China Party thus: the party was not destructive but wished to see Christian schools registered with the government, shorn of their "foreignness" and transformed into Chinese institutions. They also wished a complete separation of education and religion.

#### ATTACK FROM TWO SOURCES

From what has been quoted above it is quite clear that this attack on missionary schools came from two sources: the first was a growing nationalism, which objected to Christianity as adding cultural aggression to the already galling economic aggression that had been imposed by the Western Powers; the second source of anti-religious spirit came from certain returned students from France, America and Japan. It would

be well to point out that Protestant missionaries, and certain Catholics for that matter, were partially responsible for the first cause. It would not only be very difficult to justify the requirement that all students in mission schools attend religious instruction and religious exercises, whether they belonged to the religion of the school in question or not, but it could certainly be justly charged that many of the missionary schools were either consciously or unconsciously trying to westernize their students as well as christianize them. Some might object that, when parents or children enter a school that requires attendance at religious classes and exercises, they have made a free choice that the children take part in these exercises, and that thus the school is justified in requiring attendance at religion classes. However, this may be true where there are plenty of schools but it is not true where schools are so few that children must attend such schools or be content to grow up without an education. In this case the child or the parents have to do violence to their own religious convictions, or to liberty of conscience, in listening to religious instruction to which they do not subscribe.

Such attitudes as cited above had also taken root in the students who were products of missionary schools. For example, the Vice-minister of Education, Mr. King Chu, a Protes-



tant, explained the government's attitude as follows:

It is a decided policy of the government to separate education from religion. To avoid religious controversy in schools on the one hand and to prevent any religious organization from forming a system of education parallel to the government school system which might in time become an irreconcilable group within the system on the other hand, the government has decided not to allow any compulsory training in any grade of schools. Below Junior Middle Schools, no religious instruction is allowed because the Ministry rules that young pupils under fifteen years of age are not mature enough to make an intelligent choice for themselves so far as religion is concerned. (*The Chinese Symposium*, edited by Sophia Zen, (Shanghai: 1931, p. 257).

Equally unsympathetic was the reply of Minister Chiang Mon-lin, who had studied under Catholic auspices.

To sum up: there is not one sole religion. If we allow each religion in the name of education to vie with one another to propagate religion, the natural tendency will be to create divisions and strife.—Hence to have elective religious courses in Junior Middle Schools and to permit the privilege of worship in primary schools, embodies obstacles too difficult to permit the Ministry to grant the request (which the Protestant Churches had presented). Moreover, we hope that you will consider in a sympathetic way this our humble opinion regarding the restrictions on propagation of religion in schools. Let this be considered final and not subject to further review. (*The China Educational Review*, 1929, p. 272-281).

The words "humble opinion" seem

belied by the words which follow, words that smack of an Emperor's decree or a totalitarian regime.

On the other hand, the contradictory position taken by the government, which in principle granted religious liberty to nationals but at the same time prevented teachers from imparting religious instruction even to followers of that particular faith, found adversaries among the moderate elements of the country and even in official quarters. As Mr. Ying Ch'ien-li wisely remarked, "The Chinese are tolerant and do not wish to countenance such intolerance as was manifested in the anti-Christian movement." In 1932, Generalissimo Chiang in his Changsha address spoke as follows:

The Chinese people are in great need of religious schools. If there are still people who harbor prejudices about them, it is simply out of ignorance of their character. . . . I am convinced of the great influence exerted by such schools for the peace and welfare of China. (*Reignments B.S.*, n. 141, 1).

The present Minister of Education, Chu Chiahwa, likewise stated:

Whatever the worth of religion in itself, it certainly contains strong educational values. Consequently the government should drop its policy of intervention since religious instruction not only does not hinder the reconstruction of China but on the contrary, it may afford positive aid to its fulfillment. (*R.B.S.*, 152, 3).

During the early part of the Sino-

Japanese War, in April 1938 at Hankow at a meeting of missionaries, Madame Chiang Kai-shek spoke of the great work that had been done for the wounded and the refugees by the Missions. She stated that the government appreciated this work and that the Generalissimo had decided to amend the old regulation and to permit Christian schools to teach the Christian religion as a facultative course. Nearly a year later, the Ministry of Education made a revision of the prohibitive regulations and allowed elective religious courses in primary and Junior Middle Schools.

The measure is *supposed* to have been approved by the Executive Yuan and promulgated in the Government Gazette. However, the only record we have of it is from the "*Hsin Wen Pao*" for March 2, 1939. In Article 9, we read:

If, in private schools, there are courses of religion, pupils are completely free to participate in them as in facultative subjects. If, outside of school hours, there are religious ceremonies, pupils are free to attend them.

However, in the Ministry of Education Revised Regulations for Private Schools published May 7, 1946, Article 6 seems to have returned to the original regulation, Article V, of August 29, 1929:

A private school founded by a religious body is not permitted to give religion as a required subject, nor is religious propaganda permitted in class instruction. If there are any religious exercises, stu-

dents shall not be compelled nor induced to participate. No religious exercise shall be allowed in primary schools.

In order to clarify this matter, I wrote to Dr. Hang Li-wu, Vice Minister of Education and asked him about the Revised articles of 1939, and the interpretation of Article VI of the Revised Regulations of 1947. They were unable to find any record of the Revised Regulations of 1939. Since these were only printed as a news item in the "*Hsin Wen Pao*," it is possible that there was a mistake or that they were merely orders and not revised regulations. In any case, the revised Regulations of 1947 supersede these.

The legal department of the Ministry of Education interprets Article VI as meaning that free classes of religion may be held in any private school no matter whether it is primary, middle, or university and that religious exercises may be held in middle and university schools but that no one must be compelled nor induced to attend them, but that in primary schools such religious exercises are not permitted to be held. Although this would seem to be the natural meaning of the regulation, local inspectors who are either anti-religious or unfriendly have often used this regulation to prohibit religious classes in primary schools. Hence this official interpretation may be referred to them in the future when free classes of religion are given

in primary schools. This may also serve to remove the excuse that some primary schools have given for not having such classes for children who are members of the Catholic Church or for those children whose parents desire them to have some religious instruction.

#### OPPOSITION MELTING AWAY

Such has been the attitude of those in the government toward missionary education in the past. With the registration of most schools and their conforming themselves to the Government's program, much of the militant opposition has melted away. Likewise, with the passing of the returned students from France and the better understanding of religion's place in education by returned students from America, opposition from that source has largely disappeared. The great promises of a man-built Utopia held out by the American Positivists and Pragmatists of the early 20th Century were blown to bits by two wars which have humbled both social and physical scientists alike.

Aside from these considerations, I thought it would be both interesting and profitable to approach the Ministry of Education for some semi-official statement of the Ministry's present attitude toward missionary schools. When Minister Chu Chia-hwa was absent in Taiwan, I approached the Hon. Hang Li-wu, Vice

Minister and policy forming member of the Vice-ministers. Dr. Hang was most friendly and frank in all his replies to my questions and gave me permission to quote his replies to this Assembly.

Dr. Hang said that missionary schools have done a great deal as an aid and auxiliary to government education in the past. He stated that the Government welcomes all grades of missionary schools, that is, primary, middle and university. It is glad to have the assistance of those now in existence and will welcome new schools of all grades so long as they conform to the government regulations concerning such schools. Dr. Hang said that the Government realizes that they lack trained personnel in such large numbers that they must rely on the help of missionary schools to help in the education of China's youth. When asked what particular kind of schools the Government would welcome, Dr. Hang replied that they would welcome Middle Schools, Universities and Colleges of University rank. The government would especially welcome polytechnic schools, vocational schools, engineering colleges, and agricultural colleges. Dr. Hang said that while the government welcomes universities, they felt that the demands of a university mean the spreading of men, money and resources, so that the result would be a second-rate university, whereas if the missionary organization were

to concentrate on a college, the result will be a first rate college which could create real leadership in that particular field.

#### NATIONALIZATION OF SCHOOLS

When asked if the Government or the Ministry favored nationalization of all schools, Dr. Hang replied that they certainly did not and would not in the future.

In the first place, the Government did not favor it as a policy and, secondly, the government was absolutely unable to do so financially. He added that a number of non-missionary private schools had petitioned to be nationalized but the government could not take care of them. Mr. Ying Ch'ien-li of the Ministry corroborated these statements of Dr. Hang Li-wu, and further stated that there would be such strong opposition voiced against the total nationalization of schools that in the Constitutional Period it would be highly improbable. A high Government official pointed out that both Protestant and Catholic Chinese holding high positions in the Ministry of Education manifested a friendly spirit on the part of the Government toward missionary education. He likewise noted that the reception given to His Eminence, Cardinal T'ien, by the Kuomintang on his visit to Nanking two years ago, indicated a friendly attitude on the part of the controlling party in the government. The Chan-

cellor of the National Chengchi University of Nanking, Dr. Ch'en Shih-fu, stated that Chinese education needed the presence of missionary schools of all grades to help the government to take care of the large number of students, to give them technical training and especially to give them discipline in conduct and respect for authority which is so badly needed at the present time.

In regard to the use of foreign languages in teaching, Dr. Hang Li-wu said that even more classes could be taught in foreign languages than are being taught at present, especially in institutions of higher rank. More English, more French and more Russian would be welcomed.

#### A CHEERING PICTURE

Certainly, these statements seem to present a rather cheering picture of the Government attitude toward missionary schools, but then we may be permitted to wonder what might happen if some one like Dr. Hu Shih would be ushered into office. Perhaps time and experience have altered his earlier Positivistic and Pragmatic prejudices against religion and its connection with education. Actually, he is quoted in *Time* magazine for December 22, 1947 (Vol. L, No. 25) as saying that for the next ten years China ought to concentrate all her scholars, dollars and energies on five (or at most ten) select universities. The presidents of China's 138 lesser

colleges thought that such a plan would mean merger or death. The attitude of the present Ministry of Education is the exact reverse of this plan, for they desire more universities to care for the thousands of discontented young men and women who are yearly clamoring for the chance of a university education. While Dr. Hu Shih's plan, no doubt, refers to Government Universities, yet if he were Minister of Education, perhaps such a plan might conceivably include a similar frame of mind toward private schools.

Thus far I have treated of the Government's official attitude both past and present toward missionary education. We might call it the juridical side of the question. However, there is a more difficult question, and in the minds of most of you, no doubt, a more practical question, i.e., the attitude of the local Bureau of Education in each city and province of the country with which you have to deal. Yet the juridical question is of great importance in dealing with the local Bureaus because if we understand well both our rights and duties, we have a solid basis for defending our rights and recognizing our duties. We should first see to it that we make our schools first rate in so far as we are able, by fulfilling the requirements of the law and making our schools models. Secondly, if we know our rights according to the Ministry of Education regulations,

we may courteously but firmly hold out for them. If we have disposed of difficulties that come from these two sources, we may come to the third source of difficulties, which is one of human relations. To eliminate such difficulties that spring from human relations, we must foster good relations with members of the local Bureau of Education and with leaders of both Government and private educational institutions in our area. This need not be done in any political or hypocritical way but should be based on true charity toward our fellowmen. This charity requires sacrifice of time, of personal feelings and prejudices, of humility about our own work and accomplishments, and of a sympathy and tolerance of the views of others, where no principle is involved.

Of course, I realize that where bad relations with local authorities are already in existence, it will be a slow and difficult process to overcome them and that there are other cases where, in spite of all the efforts of the missionary, local authorities prove themselves to be obstinate obstacles to good relations. These cases require special consideration and help which I am not attempting to explain here.

Therefore, we should further the present favorable attitude of the government toward Catholic Education by making our schools model schools which train good Chinese citizens.

We should form a committee to clarify, so that we may teach religion as an elective subject in any grade of education.



### *Security in the Atom Bomb?*

"But let me warn you that if this Myth that atomic energy is simply a military weapon becomes a fixed thing in people's minds, if we accept the error that it can never be anything else, then certain most unhappy consequences will follow. For we will become wholly preoccupied with only its destructive uses, we will wear blinders that shut out its full importance. And we will therefore never make it anything but a weapon.

"An even more baleful consequence will ensue if we persist in this Myth. We will drift into the belief—some people already have such a belief—that we Americans are safe in the world, safe and secure, because we have this devastating weapon—this and nothing more. We will then tend to relax, when we need to be eternally vigilant, constantly alert. We will come to believe that for our nation to be secure in a troubled world all we need is this powerful weapon.

"The Myth will cause us to fall into an even deeper pit of error. We will grow forgetful of the *true sources of America's strength*. We will be misled into believing that America is strong because of military force alone, when in truth the foundation of our strength and amazing vitality is not in material things but rather in the spirit of this nation, in the *faiths we cherish*.

"We are a people with a faith in each other—and when we lose that faith we are weak, however heavily armed. We are a people with a faith in reason, and the unending pursuit of new knowledge; and when we lose that faith we are insecure, however heavily armed. We are a people with a faith in God, with a deep sense of stewardship to our Creator, the Father of us all; and when that is no longer strong within us we are weak and we are lost, however heavily armed with weapons—even with atomic weapons—we may be."—*From an address by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, before the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill., Dec. 16, 1947.*

## THE EDITORIAL MIND

### *"Anno Santo"*

FOR "the whole Catholic universe" the year 1950 will be a time of preeminent joy, for the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, has proclaimed it a Holy Year of Jubilee. The great moral renovation which is, historically, a product of these rare celebrations, will accompany the forthcoming Holy Year, with God's grace.

Penitents all over the world will yearn to make the pilgrimage to Rome in the Holy Year, praying with the Supreme Pontiff: "May this really Holy Year, by the grace of the Most High, and through the intercession of the august Mother of God, the Prince of the Apostles and of all the Saints, be for the human family a harbinger of a new era of peace, prosperity and progress."

The symbolism of the most distinctive ceremonial of the Year of Jubilee, surrounding the "holy door," recalls the exclusion of Adam and Eve from Paradise according to some writers. The holy door of St. Peter's Basilica is opened traditionally on the Christmas Eve preceding the Holy Year of Jubilee, by the Pontiff in person, and is closed by him on the Christmas

Eve following. Each of the holy doors of the other Basilicas is similarly opened by a Cardinal deputed for the purpose.

The Pope knocks on the holy door three times with a hammer of precious metal, singing the versicle, "Open unto me the gates of justice." The masonry, which has been loosened beforehand, is made to fall at the third blow, and after the threshold has been swept and washed, the Pope enters first.

When the Catholic pilgrims flock to Rome during the "Anno Santo," they will pass through the same holy doors, in fulfilling the conditions for obtaining the Jubilee indulgences, conditions which include Confession, Communion and visits to the Basilicas during the Jubilee time.

The Holy Father's invitation to pilgrims from all parts of the world to visit the Eternal City during the Holy Year shows the confidence of His Holiness in the prospect for the attainment of the just and lasting peace which he has so ardently prayed and worked and hoped for during "the sad times that have just passed"—THE FLORIDA CATHOLIC, *St. Augustine, Fla., June 11, 1948.*



## Watch Ireland

IN KEEPING with its notable industrial progress in recent years, Ireland (the Free State) has established a commission of vocational organization.

The commission's recommendations are receiving serious consideration from political and other leaders, reports *Social Justice Review* of St. Louis, "and there is hope of their developing into a full-blown social and economic order."

The Catholic Societies Vocational Organization conference has asked each political party whether it favors a vocational order of society. One party, the *Clann na Poblachta*, replied its policy was to set up "vocational councils with advisory functions." The National Labor party, with 120,000 members, gave an emphatic "yes" reply.

These and other groups, representing a large section of the Irish people, have expressed their intention to promote a new order of an institutional nature. Such an order, a "System of Industries and Professions," was specifically urged by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical *On Reconstructing the Social Order*, issued seventeen years ago.

Skeptics here might object that the success or failure of such a scheme in Ireland would mean little or nothing for the United States because the Irish industrial setup is not compar-

able to ours. However, human nature there is the same as here. Ireland's industrial problems, on a small scale, present many of the same elements as ours. Without any doubt American labor and management can benefit by Ireland's experiment.

American Catholics, at least, should be stimulated by Ireland's example. As Frederick P. Kenkel contends in *Social Justice Review*, "a constructive program of this kind . . . is a positive need if the growth of Communism is to be halted."—THE MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, *Detroit, Mich., June 10, 1948.*

## A Call to Arms

AS soon as Andrew found Christ, he ran off to tell his brother, Peter, the good news and to bring him to the Master. As soon as Philip found Christ, he ran off to find his friend Nathaniel and tell him of the Lord. That seemed the natural thing to do. And encouraged by their Master, they went ahead with this good work. Relations, friends, chance contacts and fellow workers—all were introduced to the Preacher from Nazareth. Soon there was a coterie, then a following, a society of enthusiasts and finally the Church.

Strengthened and directed now by the Holy Spirit, the infant Church under its fishermen spread with baffling rapidity. The greatest power on earth opposed it. But in spite of

the Roman Empire friend told friend of the Good News, of the Man who was God, of the hard truths that lifted men up to the Divine. There were still few priests but every Christian was a missionary. The Church prospered.

Persecutions, burnings, bloody arenas, secret police—nothing could halt its progress. It crossed the Mediterranean, swept along the Roman roads, spread over the Alps, engulfed Europe and, finally, its Emperor.

Then a strange thing began to happen. As the numbers and organization of the church increased, the pioneering zeal of the ordinary Christian began to wane. They fought Mohammedans, no doubt, but because all in Europe were Christians, the urge to pass on the Good News lessened and died and the active spreading of the gospel fell more and more to the clergy alone.

Then came men who called themselves reformers, not to awaken the old zeal of the ordinary Christian, but to re-edit the Good News, chop it, change it and water down a Divine Revelation until it suited the prejudices of the mob. Catholic peoples were shocked into activity again. But power politics, nationalism, greed and war clouded the issue. In the confusion men succumbed or were deceived. Millions fell away from the pure doctrine of Christ; the faith of millions more was weakened.

That is how the world still stands

today, with the added menace of atheism on the march. That is why it is necessary to go back to the old methods to re-convert the world. As Andrew brought Peter to Christ, so brother must bring brother closer to the Master. As Philip passed on the Good News to Nathaniel, so friend must influence friend for good. As new Christians in the holy infancy of the Church showed a new spirit to fellow workers on the lake, in the fields and around the markets, as they cautiously passed on the Good News to those who seemed ready for it, so today each Catholic is called by the Holy Father to imitate that daily missionary zeal of the first Christians and in office, factory, workshop and home to convert or encourage those around him. He is asked to do this consciously and methodically, counselled to combine with others, organize themselves into small bands that will help and encourage their members, become aware of their own shortcomings and, having overcome these, use their new strength to draw those they can influence nearer to Christ. —SUNDAY EXAMINER, *Hong Kong, China*, March 30, 1947.

### *Sources of Democracy*

DEMOCRACY as we understand it is found, of course, in the United States and Canada. South American countries have it, in varying degrees. We recognize its opera-

tion in Ireland, England, Scotland and Continental Western Europe, in Australia and New Zealand, in limited areas of Asia and Africa.

We do not find democracy in Japan, except where it is being imported from the West. We do not find it in vast regions of China, India and numerous other Asiatic countries, nor in most of Africa. Nor do we discover it in those immense areas under communistic domination.

When we analyze this picture, we realize that democracy as we know it exists only in Western Europe and in those countries which have been settled by peoples permeated by the religious, moral principles which have been the basis of western civilization.

These principles are basically the existence of God, the creation of man by God, the inherent dignity of man as a son of God with an immortal soul, a dignity demonstrated to its fullness by his redemption by the Saviour of mankind.

Every democratic institution has its roots in these principles. The be-

ginning of the Declaration of Independence is to a large extent but a restatement of them. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these rights are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Since our democracy is the product of religion, of Christianity, democracy will continue to flourish only as the Church flourishes. Should the source of the principles of democracy languish, democracy itself must inevitably fail, just as surely as darkness follows the setting of the sun. Its instinct for self-preservation, therefore, requires that democracy foster religion, the efforts of the "wall between Church and State" theorists to the contrary notwithstanding.—THE CATHOLIC NEWS, *New York, N. Y.*, June 12, 1948.



"Virtually all the schools in the thirteen colonies and in the early States were religious schools supported by public funds. They represented the common form of government-supported educational establishment until the great waves of immigrants began to seep in upon the country around 1848."—*The Rev. John A. O'Brien in the CHRISTIAN CENTURY*, May 19, 1948.

# The Roman Catholic Church

JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, S.J.

Editor, THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

Reprinted from THE ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY  
OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE\*

**R**ELATIVELY few people today ask what the Catholic Church *is*, but a great many seem to be asking what the Catholic Church *wants*. Especially, what does it want in the temporal order of human society; what place does it want for itself in relation to the structures of the social order; what part does it want to play in the process of their reconstruction?

## ESSENTIAL CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH

The two questions are, of course, intimately related; the answer to the second depends on the answer to the first. However, to answer the first question would be impossible in the space at my disposal—impossible, in a sense, in any amount of space. Her children know that the Catholic Church is a mystery in the strict theological sense of the word. Her existence is not ultimately explainable in terms of human design and action; her total "idea" is not discoverable by sheer philosophical and historical research. The existence of the church hangs on a sovereignly free divine choice, whereby God *gave* to men this particular form for their religious

life; and the "idea" of the church—what she intimately is—is possessed, as a secret, by God alone. When the Catholic says: "I believe . . . in the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church," he has indeed evidence in the orders of philosophical truth and historical fact sufficient to let him know with certainty that his act of faith is reasonable; he can explain *why* he believes the church to be what it is. However, the church itself, the thing-out-there, which his act of faith touches, transcends the power of his reason to comprehend, and much more the resources of his rhetoric to explain; he cannot adequately explain what the church, in which he believes, is.

Obviously, if the church were simply a social and juridical union, into which men had gathered themselves for their own reasons, and the structure of which they themselves had determined, one could quite adequately understand and explain what it is. One can, for instance, explain what the Catholic Association for International Peace is; one can, that is, explain the common idea and end,

\* 3547 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 4, Pa., March 1948.

the common will and purpose that bind its members together into unity. And when one has explained the principle of a society's unity, one has explained what the society is.

But precisely in this regard the church escapes the comprehension of man. It is her unity that is her mystery. It is not explained by any human agreement among men to hold in common certain ideas, obey certain rules and officers, and work together towards some common ideal, as is the case with various voluntary associations. Nor is it explained by the profound exigencies for community living that are radiated in the social nature of man, as is the case with the natural institutions of the family and the state. The church's principle of unity, which makes her what she is, is found neither in the will of man nor in his nature; it is a supernatural principle. Briefly, it is the Holy Spirit Himself, as given to the church, dwelling in her as in His temple, and by His presence and action making her the Body of Christ, whose members are united, not merely by the moral bond of love or by the juridical bond of law, but by the mystical bond of a common sharing in the one Holy Spirit. As the classic formula has it, the Holy Spirit is the "soul" of the church, the hidden, inner source of her life and unity, her very "is-ness." Pius XII put the matter this way:

Although the juridical elements, on which the order of the Church also rests, have their origin in her divine constitution as given by Christ and themselves contribute to the attainment of her celestial end, nevertheless, what lifts the Christian society to a level that transcends the whole order of nature is the Spirit of our Redeemer—the Spirit who, as the source of all graces, gifts, and charisms, is forever filling the Church in her inmost being, and energizing within her. To give an analogy: as the structure of our mortal body is, indeed, a marvelous work of the Creator, that nevertheless falls far short of the lofty dignity of our mind and soul, so the social structure of the Christian community, though it proclaims the wisdom of its divine Architect, is something of an essentially lower order in comparison with the spiritual gifts whereby it is endowed with life, and with their divine source (the Spirit).<sup>1</sup>

There is, therefore, a mystery in what the Catholic Church is. Towards acquiring some manner of intelligence of it, by exploring its content and dimensions, a whole theology of the Mystical Body has been developed in Catholic sources; but it cannot even be outlined here.

#### DUAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH

The answer to the second question—what the Catholic Church wants—involves no mystery; no part of it is hidden in the mind of God, much less in the secret councils of the hierarchy. And since it is the ques-

<sup>1</sup> Encyclical, *Mystici Corporis* (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943), p. 39. Cf. also *Catholic Mind*, November, 1943, pp. 24-25.

tion more frequently asked (whoever seriously asks what the Catholic Church is has somehow already reached the answer in his heart), I shall take it up here; not, indeed, with the thought of giving a complete answer—the subject is too large. What follows is simply an introduction to the answer.

Perhaps one could most successfully approach the answer by considering the two things that the pastors of the church are in these days insistently saying to the laity. On the one hand, the laity are being taught that their Christian faith is a value in itself, to be lived for its own sake, independently of any repercussions it may have in the temporal order; on the other hand, they are being taught that their faith is also a value in the temporal order, and must have repercussions there, for the sake of the temporal order. They are being urged to seek simply and solely the kingdom of God in the heavens, and they are being urged to collaborate towards a Christian civilization on earth. It is impressed on them that it profits a man nothing to gain the whole world, if he lose his own soul; and it is likewise impressed on them that they must gain the whole world on peril of losing their souls. Their religious life is being given two orientations—towards God and His eternal city, and towards earth and the city of man. They are enjoined to work out their own salvation, keeping them-

selves immaculate from the world; and they are enjoined to immerse themselves in the world and work at its salvation. These two sets of injunctions are seemingly opposed; but their principle of synthesis is in the nature of Christian faith itself. And it is this synthesis of values in their faith that is the cardinal contemporary lesson of the church to her children.

#### THE HOPE OF ETERNAL LIFE

The first part of the lesson has the primacy in importance. The basic tenet of the Catholic faith is, of course, the incarnation—the fact of the Word made flesh. The Word was God, the only-begotten God, the Son; He became man, born of a virgin, one of us; He suffered, died and rose again. And these resounding facts have one central significance—they have lifted the goal of human hopes. Not only is there now forgiveness of sins, but what the Gospels call “eternal life” is now given to man as his destiny; and it is put within his reach in that God through Christ has promised him the Holy Spirit, the “energy of the Most High,” as an indwelling power, to heal his nature and lift his life to a new level and carry him through to his appointed end.

This hope of eternal life was a new thing. Aristotle’s highest thought had set before man, as his sole possible end, a terrestrial beatitude—the

felicity and peace of a virtuous life in the ordered human city. For the rest, man might indeed dream of playing the immortal, but his real horizons of hope were bounded by earth and time. In later ages, human reason, not without clarifications from Christianity, would teach that man was entitled by his spiritual nature to hope for a life beyond time, and a beatitude consisting in the possession of God through the possession of His creation, in whose myriad manifestations the soul, freed from the limitations of the body and sense, would know and love Him as in His images and in the effects of His power. No mean hope, this; but one infinitely inferior to the Christian hope, which is based not solely on a philosophy of human nature but on the fact of the resurrection of Christ. The eternal life now put within the reach of man by the Word made flesh is the possession of God as He is in Himself, in a vision face to face, without the distorting, darkening "glass" of creatures interposed. Made son of God and co-heir of Christ by baptism, the Christian is destined to possess the heritage proper to Christ the Son—to know and love the Father as the Son knows and loves Him, to be in God "as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee" (*John* 17: 21).

This eternal life, this union with the Father through Christ in the Spirit, is the "pearl" and the "treasure" (*Matt.* 13: 44-46). And such

is its value that a man must sell all he has to purchase it. Compared with it, all the values of earth and time pale into shadows. The world is well lost, if this eternal life be gained. Beside it all other hopes lose their hold upon the heart. And if this hope be frustrated in the end, through man's negligence and sin, it does not matter what else he has achieved; he has lost everything, in that he himself, in his inmost self, is "lost."

This doctrine of the treasure and the pearl is necessarily in the foreground of the church's preaching. In a sense, she has nothing else to announce than this, the basic "good news"; she would cease to be herself were she to teach or enjoin anything not related to it. The highest thing, then, that she has to say about her faith is that it is "the beginning of eternal life," and as such, an end and value in itself, not to be perverted by subordination to any other end, even the end of peace and justice and love here on earth.

#### SEPARATION FROM THE WORLD

This is the primary doctrine of the church. What perhaps gets emphasis in the America of our day is its austerity—an emphasis needed because the seductions of secularism, with its doctrine of the primacy of this-worldly material values, are so strong. Against them, the church insists that the pearl is not purchased save at the price of all a man has; eternal life is



not won by those who have their hearts set on this world and on the things—even the beautiful things—of time; the destiny of man is achieved only by the full discipline of unworldliness and otherworldliness. To this full discipline, to this "selling of all," the church urges her children. And to help them bear it, she counsels their participation in all the great movements that are stirring her contemporary life, in answer to the challenge of secularism—the Biblical movement, the theological movement, the liturgical movement. The theme of the Bible, of theology, and of the liturgy is simply "eternal life." Diligent study of them will, therefore, so quicken the beckoning of this destiny, the "joy of the Lord," as to fortify Christians against the appeal of other invitations; it will make their Christian hope so triumphant in their hearts that they will heed St. John's injunction, "Love not the world and what the world has to offer" (1 John 2: 15).

This, then, is the first thing that the church is saying today. There is need to recall it here; otherwise it is impossible to see in perspective what the church wants in the temporal order. Moreover, the message itself, although ancient, is precisely sharpened to the needs of the time. It is needed not only against secularism, but also against a more subtle temptation. So many, so grave, and so urgent are the problems of the

temporal order that there is the temptation, felt principally by noble souls, wholly to immerse oneself in them, to the oblivion of "the one thing necessary." There is the temptation to identify the kingdom of God with a just social order, and then to seek first the justice of the latter, thinking that all else will be ours as well. There is the temptation to make the Christian faith itself simply a means to an earthly end—social change and progress toward an ideal of human brotherhood. All this would be to make the heaven simply part of the dough. And against all these temptations the doctrine of the pearl needs emphasis.

#### ERROR OF "SOCIAL MODERNISM"

On the other hand, this doctrine, which teaches detachment from the world, cannot be made the pretext for disengagement from the world's problems. And here we come to the second major emphasis in the church's teaching today. Pius XI reserved some of his most scathing denunciations for what he called "social modernism." It is the appearance in the Christian camp of the nineteenth-century liberal thesis with regard to church and state, that derived from Kant and was condemned in the *Syllabus*. It maintained that "religion has nothing to do with politics," with the order and institutions of the earthly city; that religion is a "purely private matter"; that social, political

and economic processes are immune from regulation by the heteronomous norms of religion and ethics. The Christian "social modernist" would maintain that his faith should have its sole flowering in personal piety; that he must keep his own hands clean by refusing to grapple with the grimy machinery of society. (One remembers Péguy: "Kantianism has clean hands; but it has no hands.")

This "social modernism" is an error on many counts; I shall signalize but two. The first is based on the fact that the regeneration of baptism, though it makes a man a "new creature" endowed with a new life, does not transfer him into a new world. He must live his new life in this same old world; as a man and a citizen he is involved in its institutions, and the life of the new man in him is conditioned by them. They can favor its growth or help to kill it; they can assist him to his destiny or turn him aside from it. Moreover, he has power over them, as they over him. All the institutions of this world are imperfect, unstable, capable of transformation, subject to free human action. Consequently, both by reason of their relation to his destiny and by reason of his relation to them, the Christian has the responsibility to see to the creation of conditions that will be favorable to his movement towards eternal life.

These favorable conditions are not, indeed, indispensably necessary; the

Christian life can be lived to perfection in the inhuman conditions of a concentration camp. But it is so lived only by heroes; and the run of men are not heroic. The ordinary man needs the support of an environment whose institutions are shaped by the forces of justice and charity; otherwise he will fail to be ordinarily just and ordinarily charitable. Here, then, is the point of insertion of the church's will with regard to the social order. Institutions that violate justice and charity are a manner of institutionalized sin, and a force for personal sin. And sin is the church's enemy—her only enemy, but everywhere her enemy, whether in the city as such or in the individual. Hence she enters the city as such—the political, social, or economic order—*ratione peccati*, by reason of the sin there found.

Much could be said about the historical development and exercise of this mission of the church in the temporal order *ratione peccati*. My concern here, however, is simply to point out the contemporary application—the insistence on the responsibility and duty of such action by every single Christian. To say that the church has a mission in the temporal order is not to defend what is called "clericalism." It is simply to say that the virtualities of Christian faith are not exhausted by personal piety; they demand an attack on organized injustice in all its forms; they demand positive action to establish and secure such

institutions in the temporal order as will be favorable to the growth of the seed of eternal life planted in baptism.

Against this reason for Christian concern with the temporal order it might be argued that it is "interested," it reveals no concern for the human as such, it regards the city and its good order as simply a means to a higher end. The objection does not, of course, destroy the validity of the reason, but it does bid us look beyond it for another.

This second reason is based on the fact, first, that human life is essentially a relationship between persons, and second, that the perfection of this relationship is precisely the end and purpose of the social order, with all its varied institutions. Society is a rational process, and its rationality consists essentially in its progress—never rectilinear, always interrupted by regressions—towards an ideal of human community, structured after the demands of social justice and the equality of man with man, and informed by the spirit of social charity and the solidarity of all men. Moreover, this rational process and its ideal goal is the object of a divine will. God wills not only the eternal salvation of man, but his perfection here on earth as man—the perfection of his intellect, the perfection of his power over the material world and its energies (including atomic), the perfection of his social living. These things are ends and values in them-

selves, and not simply means. In the Christian scheme they are, indeed, only intermediate ends, being proper to earth and time; but nonetheless they are ends, and the very nature of man makes them desirable.

#### HUMAN UNITY

My point is that Christian faith here enters to affirm and support and then enlarge these human desires for the "secular" end of perfect human community—domestic, national, international. Obviously, Christian faith asserts its own supernatural ideal of human unity. It asserts, too, that this ideal will never be achieved on earth; it will always be blocked by the disorganizing action of Satan, by the divisiveness of sin, by the never completely healed disorder in the nature of man that makes him strangely tend to chaos. However, though Christian faith sanctions no myth about the city of God as realizable on earth, it allies itself strongly with the human hope for unity in the city of man. And for no mere sentimental reason. The Greek Fathers taught that the process of realizing mankind's "given" unity made a new beginning, on a plane higher than nature, in the fact of the incarnation: in asserting His oneness with man, Christ asserted the oneness of all men in Him. Moreover, He died, as St. John says, that He might "gather into one God's scattered children" (*John* 11: 52); and when He had

risen He sent from heaven His own Spirit to accomplish the fulfillment of the prayer in which He had summed up the redemptive significance of His mission, that "all may be one" (John 17: 21).

There is, then, in the Gospel an obsession with the idea of human unity, a passion for it. Initially, it is the passion for the unity of the church, that has consequently turned so fiercely—at times too fiercely, we may think—on the error or disobedience or schism which would divide it. But the resonances of this passion are necessarily felt also in the earthly city—again, at times too strongly, as when the political unity of the city was confused with the religious unity of the church, and the latter was promoted and defended by means proper to the defense of the former. But this was an accident of historical circumstances, an aberration induced by the exigencies of a particular phase in political development. What permanently remains, as an exigence of Christian faith itself, is the enlistment of the energies of faith in the perfecting of the city's own unity, under new and due respect for the city's presently achieved autonomy.

The church does not and cannot want her own unity, much less the structures that preserve it, to be reflected in the earthly city; the point has recently been emphatically made by Pius XII in a series of discourses to the Roman Rota, begun in 1945.

But the church does want the city to have its own proper unity—its own juridical structure wherein the equal rights and freedoms of citizens will be safeguarded, and its own spirit of civic friendship whereby the high values of human living-together will be ensured. And to this end she is urging her children, as citizens, to employ the *mystique* of unity that is inherent in their faith. There is no more effective weapon against the divisive factors within the city: misunderstanding, jealousies, dissensions between classes, clashes of opposed egoisms, the conflict between ambitions for power—all the many forms that hostility and hate can take.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF CIVIC FRIENDSHIP

I suppose, then, that what the church ultimately wants in the temporal order is to see there reflected, in civic friendship, the spirit of charity that is the primary expression of her faith. She wants this for the sake of the city, as essential to its good; she wants it, too, as the necessary expression of her own faith. Here is the point of synthesis of the twin values in faith—its value for eternal life and its value for temporal life. Love of the city's common good, with the faith in goodness that it implies, is itself an inchoative form of the love of the true God who is Goodness itself; this is so, whatever the strenuously agnostic secularist may say. And if this be so, how shall Christian

faith in Christ, the Son of God and one-time citizen of earth, not be the dynamic principle of a great love of the city's common good?

Obviously, the love of God and neighbor is no substitute for political maturity or for the high technical competence required in organizing the economic life of man. The church never said it was. What she says is that without the *mystique* of charity the technique of politics and economics will not be able to do more than tinker with the social machine; it cannot make it run. Again, charity is no substitute for social justice; it does not itself regulate the relations between men as possessors—that is the proper work of justice. But unless the relations between men as persons are regulated—and this is the proper function of charity—their relations as possessors will always be snarled. There is no society, national or international, without civic friendship as its soul. And since the time when political liberalism went beyond its premises and committed the course of society to purely secular dynamics, nothing has happened to convince an intelligent man that society can be ensouled by civic friendship unless civic friendship itself have, as its own soul, the virtue of charity that springs from Christian faith.

I have, therefore, dealt rather in general with two things that the church wants in the temporal order. She wants her children, who are in

the temporal order, to seek solely the pearl of great price that is not formed in the shell of time, and the hidden treasure that is not found in the fields of earth. Paradoxically, they are to render their greatest service to the world by not serving the world; for only one who sells all he has on earth leaves the earth itself enriched by the bargain. And it has been well said that there are just enough saints in the world to keep it from flying completely apart. The church wants this situation to continue.

Secondly, at the same time that the church recalls her children from absorption in the temporal order, she demands their engagement in it, for two main reasons. We have not here a lasting city, but while the city does last, it must be made a city of justice and friendship—on the one hand, for the value that its order has in freeing man for the pursuit of his eternal destiny; and on the other hand for the value that its order has in itself, as a realization, always imperfect indeed, of a rational ideal of human unity.

It may be said that this statement of what the church wants in the temporal order is very general, and somewhat eschatological. Well, I was only writing a preface. And, as a matter of fact, to a statement of what anyone at all wants in time, would not the best preface perhaps be a sketch of his eschatology?

# The Law and Labor

LOUIS F. BUDENZ

*Reprinted from THE CATHOLIC COURIER JOURNAL\**

IN THE recently concluded strike of employes on the New York Stock Exchange a new and grim game was played. It might be called: "When is the Union Shop not the Union Shop?" And the answer might well be: "When it is assured by the Taft-Hartley Act."

This latest piece of legislation dealing with labor-management relations provides that the union shop shall not apply unless the majority of those working in a particular "bargaining unit" vote for it. That we well know by now.

But what the Wall Street walk-out preliminaries revealed was that if this majority is obtained—and that is not too easy—then the union can only "demand" the union shop. The employers may still reject it, and the workers have no protection from the National Labor Relations Board.

The employes of the New York Stock Exchange voted overwhelmingly for the union shop—and yet the new legislation leaves them without any protection in their vote. The employing interests may defy that vote, and all the workers can then do is strike. It can well be questioned whether any such provision does anything but increase the possibility of

further friction in the relations of management and labor.

It indicates the atmosphere of emotion—and lack of calm consideration—in which this and a half-dozen other provisions in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 were written.

It may well be asked, as a matter of fact: "How can any sort of permanent, healthy relations in the labor-management field be obtained if the union shop is to be handicapped in this way?"

If the workers are not permitted to vote in union security, then they will certainly not be inclined to give that cooperation in production which is so sorely required by present-day conditions. Particularly will this be the case when they note that real wages recently have fallen in many industries, and when they observe the neat profits which are being made by large corporations.

That is not merely a matter for labor to note down; it is of the utmost importance to management, which will be bedeviled by all sorts of difficulties in production if such an unsettled state of union security is permitted to persist.

When we take a hasty glimpse at

\* 35 Scio St., Rochester 4, N. Y., June 10, 1948

the whole course of labor legislation which led up to the adoption of the National Labor Relations Act (the Wagner Act), we can understand this the better.

#### JUNGLE LAW

Before the Wagner Act was passed, jungle law ruled in the labor-management field. The reports of the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee of the United States Senate should be recalled. They indicated a continual series of violent acts, of what can be rightly termed "jungle warfare." This was highlighted by the widespread employment of labor-spy agencies, which in their turn resorted to many types of violence in order to fatten their purses and prolong the bitterness of the contest.

The long road of stress and strain by which the corporations had sought to discover a proper channel for communication with their workers had led to failure. Their employe representation plans did not work out; suspicion ruled them and scepticism reigned among the workers toward them. The use of the "yellow-dog" contract and injunction had not aided production; they had only prepared a harvest of discontent and eventual disruption.

Every one knows that the unions had been declared to be legal organizations in the outstanding case of *Commonwealth vs. Hunt*, decided in Massachusetts in 1842. That decision

was accepted in all States and in the United States courts as the unquestioned rule.

For more than one hundred years, then, there has been no challenge to the legality of labor organizations as such. But we know very well that large employing interests all through the intervening years could not be made to respect that legality. Hence, the basis for the tooth-and-claw warfare which existed so long in the labor field.

The employing interests held two weapons in their hands—their superior economic power and the fact that the operations of the law were favorable to their efforts against the unions.

It is true that as early as 1893 the State of Indiana had sought to curb these anti-union activities by the adoption of a famous statute. This made it unlawful for any firm or its agent to prevent employes from forming unions and made it equally unlawful "to exact a pledge from workmen that they will not become members of a labor organization as a consideration of employment." Thus, the "yellow-dog contract" was thereby made illegal as well as coercion of any sort to keep a worker from joining a labor organization.

But that law was inoperative because the United States Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional in the noted case of *Coppage vs. Kansas*. It was then, passing upon a



Kansas statute similar to that previously adopted in Indiana, that the Supreme Court drew upon the Fourteenth Amendment for the defense of the corporate and employing interests. That amendment, designed to protect the rights of the freed Negro slaves, was said to protect the right of the corporations to require the signing of anti-union contracts. Otherwise, the "liberty" and "property" of the corporations would be interfered with, declared the Supreme Court.

In 1917 came the decisive case between the United Mine Workers and the Hitchman Coal and Coke Co., in which the Supreme Court gave the title of legality to the "yellow-dog" contract even when oral in character. The anti-union contract and the injunction based upon it now became the familiar methods for crushing most attempts at self organization by the working people.

That did not bring peace nor did it contribute to the increase of production on any assured basis. Labor fought and labor organizers went to jail—and strikes blazed up and working forces sulked—until the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 made the

injunction in labor disputes practically impossible. That was the forerunner of the National Labor Relations Act.

With the adoption of that measure the jungle-like character of the contest did change. Some may greet that statement with a large share of doubt. They who do that have forgotten too soon the conditions brought out in the La Follette reports, although they were published in a general complete form only a comparatively few years ago.

It will have to be readily admitted that the Wagner Act did not halt strikes. The second world war and the cooperation around the National War Labor Board did more than anything else toward that end for the duration of the military conflict. With the coming of V-J Day, however, open battle between the unions and big management broke out in intense fury and went on into the year 1946.

Blame was thus put on the Wagner Act as being too favorable to labor. Within the various States law after law hampering labor organization was adopted.



"Many a discouraged man has knelt and prayed God for the strength to carry out his duty of providing for his family. Many a worried woman has begged God for assistance in rearing her children. All too few have called upon God with the firm and trusting confidence born of the conviction that God will give the help necessary for a happy and holy family life."—*R. T. McKee in PERPETUAL HELP, July, 1948.*

# *A Pastor to His Employer-Parishioners*

REV. H. A. REINHOLD

St. Joseph's Church, Sunnyside, Washington

*My dear Parishioner:*

Last year's appeal to you in behalf of our seasonal workers from Texas and Mexico created a far greater reaction than I had expected. It was even reprinted in a national magazine, which proves that it was timely. However, this was an unexpected by-product. What it really intended to do was something very different; it was intended to arouse your interest in a problem you can solve in your own back yard with a bit of good will, a Christian conscience and a sacrifice of time and money—well spent.

I was gratified to see how speedily some of you took up the good work and thought of the words of Christ: "I was hungry and you gave me food . . . I was a stranger and you brought Me home . . . believe Me, when you did it to one of the least of My brethren here you did it to Me." (*Matt.* 25:35). Some of you built new cabins, some took a deep personal interest in their workers, paid them just and fair wages and, above all, tried to help them to adjust themselves to new living conditions. The help you gave our Spanish missionary, Fr. José Tirvio, made his work definitely easier. May I ask you to cooperate again? See to it that living and work-

ing conditions of your Mexican workers, as well as other seasonal workers, are worthy of you and your Catholic name. Help them to feel at home in our churches and encourage them to go to Mass, by letting them understand that you go yourself and, as far as they are Catholics, encourage them to fulfill their duty. Those of you who have not had the time, or the money or the thoughtfulness to improve the lot of your seasonal help, who contribute their sweat to your prosperity, and whom you expect to be responsible, willing, diligent and thoughtful of your interest, try to do so this year, even at a personal sacrifice.

By tradition, history and background the Mexicans have a hard time to fit themselves into our ways. Rash judgment and contemptuous classification of a proud race of very ancient civilization, albeit impoverished and victimized by more forceful, tougher men, with a keener eye for advantages, lead us nowhere. While some narrow zealots use their economic superiority and money to estrange the Mexicans and their children from our Faith by misrepresentation, ice cream, games and free rides to dissident churches, we have all the greater

duty as fellow-Catholics to counteract such ignoble attempts by a live Catholic faith in the spirit of the Gospels. What good is preaching in our churches and even a Spanish missionary provided for them in a sort of condescension, unless we treat them as true equals and fellow Christians? The seed of sectarianism and social radicalism of the Marxist mind grows in a soil that has been ploughed by injustice, fertilized by condemnation to lasting inferiority and watered by tears of despair.

Give your cabins another look, see that they are warm, dry, protected against dust. See to the sanitary improvement of your alleys and toilet facilities. Are the children of your workers protected against the dangers of un-supervised leisure, month after month? These are matters of your own concern—not of the welfare office or paid workers, although these, too, are needed for emergency.

The totalitarians have made us all very sensitive against interference of public agencies and organized welfare. Conditions we can cope with as

individual employers or as neighborly employer *groups* should be dealt with by ourselves. Otherwise, Chapter Five, of St. James' Epistle may apply to us: "You have kept back the pay of the workmen who reaped your lands and it is there to cry out against you." I am sure this word does not apply to any parishioner of St. Joseph's.

May I ask you a last favor? Before you let anybody around here judge the Mexicans, make him see them with their background. Say a word for them. Yes, they are different in their ways, but are what we can call "Whites" offering such an admirable spectacle right now? What about concentration camps, atom bombs, lynching, divorce, alcoholism, aren't they things that make us wonder whose philosophy of life is really the better one?

Wishing you God's blessing over your family, your work and your harvest, I am

Sincerely yours,

H. A. REINHOLD, Pastor.



"The priesthood of Christ, true, is bestowed on man; but it still remains the priesthood of Christ, even though man, who exercises the functions of this priesthood, is weak. Man merits the three adjectives—weak, finite and temporal; but the priesthood does not. It is always the same, that is, it is eternal, omnipotent and infinite, solely because of the nature of Christ."—*Eugene R. Toner, S.J. in the OREGON JESUIT, June, 1948.*

# *The Catholic Interracial Movement*

THOMAS F. DOYLE

*Reprinted from THE MARIANIST\**

A WAVE of goodwill toward the Catholic Church radiated from St. Louis last fall when Archbishop Joseph F. Ritter tilted an effective lance against racial intolerance. Negro leaders, especially, were enthusiastic in praise of the Archbishop's stand against the group of Catholic parents who had threatened legal action to restrain him from admitting Negroes to archdiocesan elementary and high schools. At Howard University, a Protestant Negro student was so impressed by Archbishop Ritter's insistence on "the equality of every soul before God" that she announced she was going to take instructions in the Catholic Faith.

To leaders of the Catholic Interracial movement, the chief significance of the St. Louis incident was not that a high-ranking prelate had upheld Negro rights, but that in doing so he gave practical endorsement to an ever-growing number of American Catholics who are making the Negro's cause their own. Unfortunately, many Catholics know little or nothing of the organized movement through which Negro and white co-religionists seek to combat anti-Negro injustices and thus end American de-

mocracy's most glaring anomaly—the denial of God-given rights to a tenth of its citizens because of color.

The Catholic interracial movement is comparatively young. It began in 1934 when Catholic Negro and white leaders at a mass meeting in New York City on Pentecost Sunday announced the formation of the Catholic Interracial Council of New York, the first Catholic group of its kind ever organized in America.

Catholic interest in the Negro is, of course, as old as the Church's apostolic mission. It was evident in America from the earliest colonial times, when priests and nuns pioneered in meeting both the spiritual and material needs of the Negro slaves. This type of interest is exemplified today in the work of missionary priests and Sisters in Negro communities in the North and the South, and in the social welfare programs of such organizations as the Friendship Houses in New York and Chicago and Fides House in Washington, D. C. The new movement, however, was, and still is, primarily educational. Its purpose is to replace false teachings concerning the Negro by the doctrines of true Christianity. In this way, it

\* 108 Franklin St., Dayton 2, Ohio, May, 1948

hopes to stimulate cooperative efforts by white and Negro Americans to outlaw all forms of racial discrimination and injustice.

The movement's objectives were clearly defined in a recent statement by the Rev. John LaFarge, S.J., editor-in-chief of *America*, the movement's founder and foremost authority. The distinguished priest-editor has been personally lauded by Pope Pius XII and his predecessor, Pius XI, for his leadership in the interracial cause. He is the author of *The Race Question and the Negro*, regarded as a veritable bible of Catholic interracialism.

#### BASIC IDEAS AND PRINCIPLES

"We don't claim," Father LaFarge wrote, "to be able to get people jobs, stop segregation, or initiate housing projects. No single group could attempt to do all that. All we try to do is to furnish to all the existing agencies of the Church and civic life certain basic ideas and principles about interracial matters which are more or less commonplaces of Christian social teaching. Our job is to provide information on these specific points so that the various agencies can translate these ideas into action in their particular sphere."

Now rounding out fourteen years of concentrated effort to arouse Catholic support of the Negro in his fight for full recognition and opportunity, the Catholic Interracial Council of

New York has helped to initiate councils in eight other key cities, and before long expects to see a dozen or more similar groups functioning throughout the country. Besides the parent group, councils have been set up in Brooklyn, New York, Washington, D. C., Philadelphia, Detroit, St. Louis, Chicago, Baltimore, and Los Angeles. Authorities claim that these strategically-located units have made phenomenal progress in rallying white American non-Catholics, as well as Catholics, to the cause.

This is not hyperbole. Negro leaders themselves have given the movement, especially the New York Council, unstinted praise. Among them is Elmer A. Carter, a Protestant, and one of the country's acknowledged experts on the interracial question, who has been quoted as saying: "I know of no organization which is serving our country more nobly in promoting ideals of democracy and equal opportunity for all citizens."

"Without fanfare, throughout the years of its existence," Mr. Carter declared, "it has penetrated into the recesses of prejudice in schools and colleges and other areas of human activity, and has replaced fear with confidence, and antipathy with understanding and respect. It has brought thousands of young men and women a realization of the teachings of their Church and their responsibility to their fellowmen."

By what means has the Catholic

interracial movement been able to merit the praise bestowed by the Protestant Negro leader? Where, specifically, is its impact being felt? These are questions many Catholics would like answered. They are particularly pertinent at a time when honest-minded Americans are asking: how can we continue to talk of democracy and brotherhood to the rest of the world when racism enjoys a comparatively free rein in many areas of our own country?

The Catholic movement believes that as more and more individuals are taught to understand and apply the Catholic ideal of the unity of all men in the Mystical Body of Christ, the more they will be moved to initiate practical programs to ensure a full partnership for the Negro in American life, and to cooperate in worthwhile projects sponsored by the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, the National Urban League, or other responsible organizations interested in Negro welfare.

Catholic interracialism seeks to make its impact felt first among Catholic leadership in all walks of life. It reasons that if the Catholic employer, trade-union leader, educator, editor or teacher can be persuaded fully to exemplify the teachings of Christian democracy, each in turn will exert a leavening influence among those under his direct sway. This is simply the principle of reaching the follower

through the leader, of propagating the truth from the top down rather than from the bottom up.

Since its program is chiefly educational, the Catholic movement's most effective medium is the *Interracial Review*, published by the New York Council. This is the only Catholic monthly exclusively devoted to expounding the Christian theory and practice of interracial justice. Copies of the *Review* go regularly to all the bishops of the country, to seminaries, Catholic colleges, newspapers and libraries, and to prominent Negro leaders, Protestant as well as Catholic. Besides informed editorials and articles on every phase of the race question, the *Review* has conducted vigorous campaigns against discriminatory groups of all kinds, and especially against denials of opportunity to Negroes in industry and the professions.

#### EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS

It is due largely to the *Review* that articles of interracial interest have been appearing regularly in leading Catholic periodicals. At the same time, the *Review* has helped create better understanding of the Catholic Church among Negroes. The Negro community is being increasingly impressed by the practical interest in its problems shown by Catholic organizations which have associated themselves with the aims of the Catholic movement. A basic postulate of the move-

ment is that racial injustice harms not only the Negro but the entire community.

The interracial movement's educational efforts are far from being restricted to the publication of an official review or the distribution of pamphlets on the race question. The New York Council, for example, conducts weekly forums at which Negro and white experts are invited to speak. It has a center which supplies speakers for Catholic organizations, interracial conferences, radio broadcasts, and social and educational group meetings. In addition, the Council sponsors bi-monthly Communion breakfasts addressed by representative speakers of both races, organizes Negro cultural exhibits, and provides counsel and guidance on all phases of the race question. All those activities, duplicated as they are by the councils in other cities, represent an immeasurably important contribution to interracial goodwill in America.

In a talk last December to Catholic interracialists in Washington, D. C., Archbishop Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, emphasized the far-reaching importance of the interracial gatherings sponsored by the movement. "Through these discussions," he said, "you create a common sentiment, you promote social relations on the basis of Christian principles; you lend your own cooperation to eliminate lamentable discriminations; and you open

avenues for progress—spiritual, educational, and even material."

Some of the outstanding achievements of the New York Council have been the inauguration of the Hoey Awards for Interracial Justice, named after the late James J. Hoey, first president of the Council, which are given each year to the two Negro and White Catholics who have done most to advance the interracial cause; the organization of a national committee which, in 1942, issued a historic statement on Negro employment; and the inauguration of interracial programs in Catholic colleges through the Alumni Race Relations Council and the National Federation of Catholic College Students. The latter organization has established interracial units on the campuses of each of its member colleges, and sponsors "Interracial Justice Week," an annual event observed in upwards of 120 Catholic colleges.

Top executive of the Council and editor of the *Interracial Review* is George K. Hunton, who has represented the Council before various legislative and civic bodies concerned with programs for improving the status of the Negro. He is a member of the National Policy Committee of the National Council for a permanent FEPC, has testified at congressional hearings on fair employment practices, and has been actively associated with community goodwill programs now functioning in eight New York pub-



lic schools. He has also conducted courses on interracial justice at Fordham University, New York, and St. John's College, Brooklyn, and has been a featured speaker before numerous Catholic organizations at their annual conventions.

#### BREAKING DOWN DISCRIMINATION

Besides their more or less uniform educational programs, the New York and other councils are active in exposing and opposing local manifestations of racial injustice. At the same time, they use every available opportunity, either independently or in cooperation with other groups, of promoting the Negro's advancement in social and economic life. The New York group played a leading part in persuading department stores to hire Negroes for top-grade jobs instead of restricting them to positions as porters or elevator operators.

One of the Brooklyn Council's most publicized activities to date has been to help induce the Brooklyn Dodgers to open the doors of Big League baseball to Negro first baseman Jackie Robinson. The Detroit Council has been outstanding in carrying the interracial message into schools through lectures and pamphlets, while the Washington Council was responsible last fall for the admission of two Negro girls into the School of Nursing of Providence Hospital—a step hailed as “the biggest interracial news in Washington in many months.”

Meanwhile, the Los Angeles Council has done remarkable work in providing legal assistance for Negro families hit by restrictive housing covenants.

These instances are sufficient to indicate the varied fields in which Catholic interracialism is making its influence felt. The councils' constant reiteration of Catholic interracial teachings has also helped to create a great deal of spontaneous reaction among Catholic organizations and institutions. The Catholic movement may claim a large, if indirect, share of credit for the opening of more K. of C. councils to Negroes; the gradual elimination of discrimination in trade unions controlled by Catholics; and the many forthright pronouncements by the Catholic Daughters of America, the Holy Name Society, and other Catholic groups denouncing racial prejudice.

The interracial councils are proving particularly effective in rallying Catholic youth behind the underprivileged Negro. They are helping to break down discrimination in Catholic colleges and other institutions where anti-Negro bias has been a source of grave scandal. One of the most heartening signs of young Catholic America's responsiveness to the teachings of interracial justice was the spontaneous pledge made by 500 students of St. Louis University in 1944 “never again to have any part in the wrongs the white men have done to God's colored children, and

to do everything in our power to prevent them."

The Catholic interracial movement was implicitly endorsed by the American bishops in their annual statement in 1943, which expressed hope "that our priests and people will seek opportunity to promote better understanding of the many factors in this complex problem (of interracial justice) and strive for its solution in a genuine Christian spirit."

It would be tedious to cite the manifold ways in which individual members of the hierarchy have aided the interracial movement. In an interview with the writer, Father LaFarge especially praised "the magnificently clear and logical stand on interracial matters taken by the archdiocese of New York under the leadership of Francis Cardinal Spellman." "Nor," he added, "can we forget the fine position of Bishop Thomas E. Molloy of Brooklyn and the other bishops of New York State which has helped the situation in the whole country."

Among the many bishops who have shown outstanding interest in the movement may be mentioned Bishop Francis J. Haas of Grand Rapids, Mich., a leader in the fight for federal fair employment legislation; Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of Boston, who has shown a practical interest in Negro education; Bishop Richard O. Gerow of Natchez, Miss., who has ordained more Negro priests than any other American bishop; and

Bishop William A. Griffin of Trenton, New Jersey, who has supported efforts to develop Catholic Negro leadership.

The interracial movement fully recognizes that its programs must be aimed particularly at Catholics themselves. It makes no attempt to deny the prevalence of racial heresy among misguided and ill-informed Catholics guilty of what Pope Pius, in a letter to Father LaFarge a few years ago, described as "racial injustices that often brand the guilty with a sin akin to fratricide." In time, however, the movement expects to align the great mass of American Catholics in a cause on which the Holy Father, at the beginning of his pontificate, invoked "an abundance of heavenly blessing."

"The Catholic interracial movement," Father LaFarge assured the writer, "is a winning cause. The program is a logical evolution of the teachings of the Church, and it is a sign of the growing consciousness of her own universality, which is, one might say, the great Catholic phenomenon of the present time. Its success is doubly assured because it is linked with the interracial program in the social order, a program which is inevitable as Americans come to understand more clearly the implications of their Constitution and to feel a deeper responsibility in the affairs of the world."

## Communism Comes to a Chinese Village

STEPHEN B. EARLEY, S.J.

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA\**

THIS IS the story of Father Francis Legrande, a Belgian Scheut missionary in the little town of Siwantse, north of the Great Wall in China. Siwantse has 3,000 citizens, and is the chief town of the district of Ch'ungli in the province of Chahar. It is one of the largest Christian communities in the north of China, and one of the oldest. Catholicity in Siwantse dates back 250 years; until recently it boasted the Bishop's residence, a seminary with 90 students for the priesthood, an orphanage with 140 children, an old folks' home, a primary school for boys and girls, a hospital, two convents of nuns, the priests' house, and finally a vast and magnificent cathedral.

Everything is gone now, burnt to the ground. There are no priests, and the Sisters are refugees. The orphanage is destroyed, and the old folks' home. Nobody knows what happened to three of the priests. Communism has freed China of all their stealing, all their oppression of the masses. Now the orphans are free. And the old folks are free, too. And the mission that took years, and lives, to build is destroyed.

Father Legrande was the parish

priest in Siwantse, and lived through the birth of Communism. He is now a refugee in Peiping. His story is interesting, for it shows very clearly Communism's pattern. It shows what might happen in Ogden, Utah, or Topeka, Kansas, or Albany, New York.

Immediately after the Japanese defeat in August, 1945, the Communists entered Siwantse. Their first step was to organize Workers' Unions, and Farm-labor Unions. Members for the unions were recruited from all the idlers, malcontents and delinquents of the village and surrounding country. With the unions organized, they embarked on their fundamental program: increase of the salary of the workers, and lowering of the rent of land.

Surely no one could find fault with such beneficial social reform. It soon proved the legal cloak to cover their policy of expropriation of all property. The minimum increase of salary demanded by the unions was 100 per cent. At times the increase attained 300, 400 and 500 per cent.

The next step was to make all the increases retroactive. Each worker was instructed to claim the increase

\* New Haven 7, Conn., May, 1948

of salary for work furnished as long before as ten and twenty years.

In practice, a worker was authorized to claim of any employer whatever increase of salary seemed good to him. The employer could ask for clemency, but he was not allowed to contest the action. If he did contest, he was always judged in the wrong, put in prison, and ended up by paying far more than the sum claimed in the beginning.

#### EMPLOYERS AND THE UNIONS

Resistance came, surprisingly enough, from the salaried people themselves; they refused to demand the sums which Communist leaders insisted were their right. The leaders were adamant. By all sorts of threats they forced the workers to exact the increase of salaries; finally a Union representative was appointed to make the demands.

It became increasingly impossible for employers to meet the demands of the Unions, so their provisions of wheat and meal were taken, then their beasts of burden, tools, bedding, household utensils, homes and even their clothing.

What the Communists did for the workers they also did for the farmers who rented land from proprietors and furnished them with an annual harvest.

"You furnish the work, and they become rich," said the leaders. Land rents, by municipal order, were re-

duced 25 per cent. Soon the figure became 80 per cent, and was also made retroactive.

The Yu family had employed for eighteen months a farm worker to whom they paid the ordinary salary. A short time after the arrival of the Communists, two of the principal leaders went to claim an increase of salary. They demanded an increase of 300 lbs. of oats a month, and demanded it be paid for twenty-three months back. The Yu family were farmers of moderate means; a frost had destroyed their harvest, and they had in all but 200 lbs. of oats. The leaders demanded money, and valued each pound of oats at twice its market value. The sum assessed finally was \$138,000. To meet it, they took Yu's three oxen, his horse, his mule, three suits of clothing and his bedding. Yu was put in prison and forty workers were brought out to the Yu household to be lodged and fed.

The Mission was next; it employed a fairly large personnel—cooks, wagon drivers, mill hands, water carriers, gardeners, etc. They were enrolled in the Workers' syndicate and forced to claim the usual increases in salary. The steward was put in jail and the Father Procurator. All the beggars and poor of the countryside were installed in the buildings of the mission.

This first attack despoiled the mission of all its money, all tools, all wheat and meal, its six mules and

four oxen, all wagons, even the mill. In addition, a fine of \$4,000 American dollars was levied. Although a vast majority of the workers secretly returned the money given them, the mission came out of this first stage of Communist aggression seriously impoverished. Even more serious was the uncertainty. All legal recourse was barred, and the way for *Tou Cheng*—"the regulation of accounts and public revenge"—was open.

A few months earlier, a group of missionaries who had been interned at Weighsien and at Peking for three years finally obtained authorization to return to the mission. So enthusiastic was the ovation given them by the people that the Communists were furious. They locked all the missionaries in one small room and searched the mission; in one room they found several bayonets which the Japanese had discarded during the war. In the hospice of the old women they found several ounces of opium. And they found a small embroidered shoe in the trunk of one of the fathers who had been interned. About the shoe they raised a great hue and cry; it had been embroidered by the children of Sainte Enfante to be sent as a curiosity to European benefactors; but they made it a clinching proof of misconduct on the part of the missionary. Father Fan and Father Yao were thrown into prison; they were kept there for four months.

In December, the *Tou Cheng*

started in earnest. According to official explanations it was directed against those who had collaborated with the Japanese, and those who had profited by exploiting the people; actually it was directed against anyone who had wealth, and against anyone who opposed Communism. Everywhere speeches and placards incited the people against the rich. It was to be the test of power, and the demonstration of the ill-fate that followed the enemies of Communism.

#### MISSION FINED THREE MILLION POUNDS OF MEAL

Three families were chosen to serve as an object lesson at Siwantse, and the heads of the families were imprisoned: one was seventy-six years old and one was eighty. They were bound, given paper hats and paraded through the town to a platform in the public square. There the public judgment was held, and the entire village was forced to assist. The Communist committee rose and shouted their charges to the people.

"Down with the exploiters of the people!" they shouted, and the people took up the shout.

One of the victims was pushed off the platform, and before the terrified crowd was beaten to death. All the women and children of the village watched and whimpered as the victim groaned and writhed on the ground.

"The day after the execution," writes Father Legrande, "the mission

was fined 3,000,000 pounds of meal. The thing was so enormous that I thought it was a joke in bad taste; but the following day when I told them it was impossible, I was thrown into prison."

The Bishop believed that the Communist occupation would be of short duration, and ordered the fine to be paid; a few days later he was in prison, too. Someone had found the encyclical on Atheistic Communism in his library. There was no money to pay the tremendous fine, so the Communist officials demanded that furniture, houses, fields, would be sold at auction. Father Legrande was forced to sign a statement declaring that of his own free will, without constraint, he would sell to the officials all the property of the mission, seminary, Bishop's residence, priests' house, the hospice for old men, boys and girls school.

"I didn't even succeed in saving the orphanage de la Sainte Enfante," he wrote. "I resisted as much as I could, but in vain. All furniture, everything which could serve their work became the property of the Reds, or rather, as they put it with supreme hypocrisy, the property of 'the masses of Siwantse.'"

"There remained only the church; it had been built twenty-five years before with the gifts of Christians of the entire vicariate. I pleaded as much as I could, told them that it already belonged to the Christian

masses. I preferred to die rather than give it up. Finally, they yielded and we kept the church. But this was nothing more than a ruse."

It was impossible to get the people of Siwantse to make demands on the church, so pagans of the neighboring village were persuaded to come to claim the church in payment for damages suffered by them at the time of the Boxer rebellion—almost fifty years before.

Armed with rifles, some fifty of them came to make their claim on the church. They stayed for two days, and finally determined to hang Father Legrande from a beam and beat him with two-by-fours. It was too much for the Chinese of Siwantse, and they attacked and drove the villagers away. Then men, women, children, all the people of the village marched to the home of the magistrate to beg that the church be left unharmed. That evening a dozen of the principal Christians were seized, bound, beaten and left for dead. It was the Communist answer to the "people."

"On the next morning," Father writes sadly, "I signed a new and final contract, selling 'spontaneously to the masses' of the neighboring village our beautiful cathedral church (the most beautiful in the north of China) with all it contained except statues, and sacred vessels which had been confiscated anyway. This time there remained nothing. We were let out of prison the day before Chinese

New Year, and Father Yao and I went to live with some peasants who were at the jail to meet us."

Fifteen families went down with the mission; they lost even the clothing for their children, and went to live on the charity of their neighbors. Some small part of the goods was distributed among the people, a bit more went to the leaders; but the greater part of the booty went into the coffers of the Communist administration.

#### COMMUNITY EXPROPRIATION

Then suddenly a ray of hope was shed with the report that Nationalist troops were approaching Siwantse. The people were delirious in their happiness. Communist expropriation had disrupted the life of rich and poor alike. Throughout the entire province of Chahar their agrarian reforms had made the ownership of even a tiny parcel of land dangerous; taxes far exceeded the revenue of the meagre harvests; and the Communist overlords were stonily rigorous in collecting the tax or foreclosing on the land.

All the land had been redistributed, with Communist sympathizers receiving the better and larger fields, but even they could get no one to work them. And there was no harvest.

In the town itself, the people had fared no better. Communists demanded domination of all social, economic and cultural life by the party; it was totalitarian government in its

most savage vein. Totalitarianism depends on its spy system, and no one knew if his next door neighbor, or even his own child, was a spy reporting disloyalty to the local government. Anyone who criticized the government was branded a reactionary, worthy of prison, of confiscation of his goods, even of violent death.

At the organized meetings or People's Court Trials the whole populace was forced to attend; no one was excused, not even the little orphans of the *Sainte Enfante*. Armed guards prevented them from leaving during the five, six and seven hour meetings; and late-comers were punished by being forced to kneel through the entire proceeding. No meals were served, no consideration taken of the burning heat of summer, nor the extreme cold of winter.

Everyone under the Communist regime must change his mentality; Communism has another idea of the world, of life, of society, of all human values. Therefore, all citizens must receive a new formation, a Communist education, and no one has the right to refuse. The children were no longer taught to read or write—that was secondary; they were taught the principles of Communism. The older people of the village were forced to attend school daily during the five winter months to acquire the new mentality that would make them worthy citizens of the Communist state. Because Christians resisted this indo-



trination more strongly than others, they were classed as especially stupid, stubborn and closed to new ideas. In the new state they must be eliminated.

All were forced to join a Communist organization, and to serve in it. The workers entered the Syndicate of Workers; farmers joined the Farm Syndicate. For the women there was a Syndicate of Women, and for the Teen-agers the Youth Organization. Even the children had their own organization, the "Erh T'ung T'uan." The able bodied must join the "Wu Wei Hui," the local militia.

Religion suffered many hardships under the new regime: Communist inspectors visited the homes and forced families to destroy the religious statues, books and relics they found there; a crucifix found in a school was smashed to bits on the ground by the head of the Communist government in front of the pupils.

Few people, indeed, profited from the Communist overlordship, and it was no wonder their hearts rose with the word of the Nationalist Government troops outside their border.

"What shall we do," queried the Communist leader, "If the government troops come back?"

"We will take to guerilla warfare," was the prepared response of the local Communists.

In July they began to evacuate the city, and General Fu Tsouo Yi, after a hard battle at Kaning, made a triumphal march across the province and

into Siwantse without firing a shot.

In all the province of Chahar the Nationalist troops were received with an almost delirious enthusiasm by the vast majority, nearly the entire population. Not that they understood much of the political struggles, nor that they were especially sympathetic with the Kuomintang as such; but they had suffered too much from the tyranny of the Communists. The priests had a long and difficult job to keep the people from reprisals on Communist sympathizers who remained when the army departed.

The Communist forces didn't go far away, and were soon heard from. They adopted the methods used during the Japanese occupation; it was their own country and they knew every nook and cranny of it. During the dark of night they descended on outlying villages, cutting up with bayonets people whom they suspected of being unfriendly to them. Terror spread as the bands of roving Communists became bolder.

A thousand horsemen were stationed at Siwantse under General Che Yu San, but they were scarcely soldiers: many were brigands who had joined the nationalist forces merely for better opportunity for looting; frequently in the evening when there were rumors of the return of the Communists, the soldiers saddled their horses, ready for a hasty departure. In desperation the people got a grant of a hundred rifles for their

own protection; and when the Communists learned of the people's militia they vowed that they would kill them all.

Soon enough the Communists had sufficient forces to surround Siwantse, and on the 9th of December the counter-attack on the city began. The west part of the city fell almost immediately, and Communists began their work of absolute destruction.

#### DEATH AND DESTRUCTION

Siwantse nestles along the side of a mountain; as soon as the west part of the city fell, the terrified people took refuge on the mountain slope. With some exceptions the soldiers were more concerned with their own safety than with fighting; the General made energetic but vain attempts to organize the defense. Soon the mountain was covered with a mass of peasants, men, women, children, who huddled there in abject terror. The priests gave group absolution to the people. The Communist forces little by little took the rest of the city, and by sundown it was once again in Communist control. The battle was not very bloody except in the neighborhood of the seminary.

At the seminary the guard was made up of the local militia; the number of Communist troops was so large that the militia fell back toward the court of the seminary, and into the building where they fired on the advancing troops.

At noon the Communists set fire to the buildings, and the fire gained headway very quickly. A dozen of the militia remained inside the building, firing desperately.

"If we must die, let us die together here," they said.

Soon it was obvious that the building was doomed, and they started the recitation of the rosary and waited for death. Days afterwards, the people dug out their bones and gave them honored burial.

The battle lust completely gripped the Communist troops and they set to work to fire the buildings of the entire mission; the library with its 10,000 volumes and its precious manuscripts dating back to the days of the first Jesuits, was among the first destroyed.

Then the Cathedral was set on fire, long after the battle had been won. Heroic Christians rushed in to stamp out the flames, and a second time the Communists set it aflame—the fire roared up and lit the whole countryside, then died and left the four walls standing bleak and ruined as a monument to Communist freedom of religion. Even the novitiate of the Chinese Sisters was destroyed.

"Seven priests were at Siwantse at the moment of attack," writes Father Legrande, "two were able to flee, one to hide himself, three were made prisoners. One remained at the orphanage with the Sisters and the children. The door of the orphanage remained open

and soldiers and leaders circulated freely; some were very correct, even benevolent; others were brutal, opening all the closets, cases, drawers, and stealing what met their eye. One group attempted to set the place on fire, but the Sisters and the children begged and began to weep. The orphanage was spared."

It was the same with the old men's home: everything was looted, furniture, bedding, even the clothing of the old men. When the Communists tried to set that place on fire, the old men swore that the place belonged to them and was not the property of the Church; so that, too, was spared.

During the battle, relatively few were killed. The Communists were many times superior in number: there were about 1,300 National army men, and more than 10,000 Communists. On every occasion they promised life to those who gave up their rifles, and they made a great number of prisoners.

About 700 civilian prisoners were gathered together in the great court. There were three priests among them, who kept circulating to different groups to give absolution. From time to time little groups were formed and led away; and soon after the echo of rifle shot and machine gun fire drifted back to the village. Days later, in the fields at the edge of town, the prisoners were found, lined up perfectly, lying face down on the earth.

"In the evening when I looked for

the body of Father Chin which someone claimed to have recognized," Father Legrande wrote, "I saw in one place a first file of twelve bodies, then one of seven. All were shot in the head."

"After successive eliminations, 172 prisoners remained in the public square; there were three priests, many old men, a cripple, a blind man and six women. On Tuesday afternoon they departed toward an unknown destination. For two weeks they traveled, always by night in the December cold, from village to village in a country extremely mountainous and covered with snow. The march was extremely painful, for the prisoners had been taken by surprise and were not dressed for the weather; the three priests wore only the lightest of clothing.

#### FATE OF PRIESTS UNKNOWN

They were sheltered in dilapidated buildings, open to all the winds without any defense against the cold that went to twenty and thirty degrees below zero. Not once were they permitted to enter a warm room or approach a fire to warm themselves. One 12-year-old of the Chang family lost four toes, and many others suffered from frostbite.

"Sixty of the prisoners were released; and most of the others either inducted into the army or shot. On Christmas eve, two weeks after their capture, four prisoners remained and

among them the three priests. We still do not know to this day what happened to them."

Undaunted by the threats against his life, Father Legrande returned to Siwantse to try to help the wounded and dying. The village was a shambles. A wagon brought the bodies of the dead into the public square to be claimed by the families.

"The bodies arrived by wagon, frightful to see, in the most painful positions, arms and legs stretched forward or sideways, all fixed with the cold and stiff as pieces of hard wood," he wrote.

The majority of dead had received a bullet in the head; some were still bound. Many had been cruelly tortured before being shot, their bodies covered with bayonet cuts on arms and legs; one had the belly ripped

open and his organs pulled out. Siwantse had 3,000 people; more than 200 civilians lay in the public square; the unclaimed bodies of soldiers was about twice that number.

"In writing these lines," concludes Father Legrande, "I have intended to tell people the lot of the Church in China, or even simply of the lot of those who defend human rights. Essentially what has taken place at Siwantse is repeated everywhere. Practically all of the dioceses in the North which are under Communist regime have been victims of the same policy of exploitation and persecution.

"There are always the same pretexts, the same methods, the same violence. Siwantse, far from being an exception, is a typical case. What happened at Siwantse can happen any place."



## THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: John LaFarge

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Edward F. Clark

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.